THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER,

CONDUCTED BY

W. K. PENDLETON.

CO-EDITOR:

PROF. C. L. LOOS.

These things I write unto thee, * * * that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.—1 Tim. iii. 14. 15.

Contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.—Jude.

VOLUME XXXVI.

BETHANY, W. V.:
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY W. K. PENDLETON.

1865

Reprinted by
College Press
Box 1132
Joplin, Missouri 64801

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 36.] BETHANY, W. V., *JANUARY*, 1865. [No. I.

INTRODUCTION.

It seems but yesterday, dear reader, that we offered you the salutations of 1864, and yet we find ourself called upon to greet you with the return of another year. The rapid current of the centuries has brought us to *Eighteen hundred and sixty-five*, and we enter upon the duties and enjoyments of the new year, with a cordial greeting to all who may admit us either to their hearths or their hearts. How rapidly the current has rolled that has brought us hither! How poor and meagre seems the treasure of the toil by the way! We look forward, and the journey seems long, and the work heavy; but we look back, and all is as a tale that is told,—a shadowy reminiscence, with but few monuments to mark our course, and but small treasure to reward our toil. Still the little that we have been able to do, we trust will be found on the side of God, humanity and truth, and therefore immortal as they. Happy are we, if even a few entries have been made in the book of God's remembrance! Even one immortal deed is more than the proudest achievements that shall perish. We buckle on our armor, therefore, and renew our warfare, for there are yet many foes to be conquered, and victories to be won, worthy of every true soldier of the cross.

The Harbinger is still set for the service of Christ and the interest of his church. The times call earnestly for such agents. The spirit of the world was never more menacing than now. Its violence is pressing us to the very horns of the altar. Its pollutions are rolling in stormy waves, against the gates of the sanctuary, and many ar defiled. Purify us, O Lamb of God, though it be through the bap

tism of thy own sufferings, purify us for the work to which we are called,—for who are these uncircumcised Philistines, that defy the armies of the living God!

Infidelity and sin are the twin birth of hell—the head and heart of all that opposes and sets itself up against the Saints of the Most High. In open or in insiduous forms they are ever arrayed against the Lord and his anointed ones, and we must meet them like men of God, or we prove recreant to the high and divine work committed to our hands. Let there be no compromise, no half way work, no dallying with the allurements of the enemy. The strife is for life or death, and let the blows be heavy and the struggle unto victory.—Let our motto be, not "victory or death,"—but—"Life or death—still victory!" The living warrior fights under the all-conquering banner of the Cross, and the dying hero falls in the arms of the all-delivering Redeemer, to revive again in the Paradise of God. In life or death, therefore, he is still a conqueror, through him that loveth us.

Many brethren are discouraged. "The wrinkled front of war" alarms them. But do they not forget that it is theirs to *smooth* this wrinkled front of war? To persuade men to beat their swords into plow-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks,—to lift up the sword against their fellows no longer and to study war no more? O that the church which is not of the world, could rise to the glory of working only for the kingdom of peace! Then would the Lord lift upon us the light of his countenance and give us peace! But we are carnal, and the fruits of the flesh corrupt our lives and prevent the blessing of the Most High. Let us awake to righteousness and sin not. Surely the Lord hath not forgotten his people, nor, though the love of many waxes cold, and the remnant be cast down, will he forsake the faithful, or permit them to be utterly overcome. We entered upon our responsibilities with the Volume for 1864, with some misgivings as to what might be the measure of our success. We knew how heavily the loss of the potent pen of our venerated father Campbell would fall upon many of his old and devoted readers, and did not expect that the Harbinger could be made to them, without his aid, what it had for so many years proved to be under his superior management. But we have been agreeably disappointed. While they lament the pressure of years which has constrained him to retire from his life long toil, they have yet been also among the foremost to stand by and encourage us in our responsible duties. It has been a source of sincerest gratification to know that many of these old and true friends and readers of the Harbinger still hail it with pleasure and confidence, and lift their voice earnestly in its behalf among their younger brethren.—While we have lost but very few of this class, we have regained ma-

ny who had for a season dropped their subscription. They have not only renewed their old relations, but assure us, many of them, that their support shall be continued. We started with a comparatively small list, but it was steadily increased through the year, and we have many assurances of a still greater enlargement of the number of subscribers for 1865. We know, that if all who have promised to aid us in extending our circulation, will only exert themselves a little in good season, we can scarcely fail to have the circulation of the Harbinger greatly extended for the present volume. Let me say to all such, that even when this shall reach them, there will still be time to do much in our aid, and should they have forgotten us hitherto, we trust their pure minds will be stirred up at least by this appeal to send us a few additional names. We shall depend upon them.

It will have been observed, by those who have seen our programme for 1865 as published in the December number for 1864, that we have laid out a wide and diversified field of labor for our current volume. We shall enjoy the assistance of several of the very ablest writers amongst us, and aim to afford to our brethren an entertainment, which cannot be found in any other journal of the age. It is not the design of the Harbinger to meet a merely *local demand for a newspaper*, nor do we propose for it to take the place of any other paper now published amongst us. We do not aim or desire to make it a rival of any useful publication, at present sustained or encouraged by our brethren. We cannot so far violate the 10th commandment as to covet even one subscriber, at the expense of any brother of the pen who may be laboring for the same high ends for which we also are striving. If we cannot obtain and retain a sustaining patronage without resorting to so unchristian, unworthy, and immoral an expedient as to seek to build up our own house by the ruin of another's, then will we desist altogether, and leave the field to others. It is in advance, a presumptive evidence of one's unfitness for the high duties of a Christian Editor, that he violates one of the express commandments of the law, in the very beginning of his work. We who are teachers of the law, shall we break the law? Before we presume to teach others, shall we not ourselves first learn? And with what confidence or authority can one commend to others the pure and peaceable fruits of righteousness, who is himself living in daily disregard of even the virtuous and honorable code of an enlightened heathen morality? We cannot consent, therefore, to hold the Harbinger up as a rival of any paper, nor urge its claims to the detriment of those of other publications.

But this is what we shall aim to do. We shall labor to fill our pages with original and valuable articles, which shall supply a want in the demands of the reading public, and which we do not see supplied

by any other publication now known to us. We shall aim to produce a paper that is *needed*, and rest our ground of patronage upon the fact that, what we bring for the public acceptance, shall have in itself a value and interest which will secure its circulation and be a full compensation for its cost. Value for value,—something the reader needs and ought in justice to himself as a man and a Christian to have, for himself and his family, and which, therefore, he is obliging both us and himself to buy; this is our idea of what the Harbinger and every religious publication ought to be,—and upon this ground we shall rest our hope of its cirulation. If we ask a brother-friend to help us to circulate it, it is because we think that in doing so, he is asking no favor for which he may not feel he is rendering one. We cannot think that religious papers ought to be supported as a matter of charity. The ground upon which we support papers ought to be that the paper is worth the price, which we pay for it. Not that the *brother* who chooses to publish it is an object of charity, and, therefore, we should take his paper. Poverty is a legitimate appeal for charity to men. But it is merit, that makes the only legitimate appeal for support to newspapers.

Dear reader, we greet you then, not as beggars asking you to buy of us filthy rags, gathered in the gutters, for the sake of *charity*—but as honest and true fellow-workers, proposing honorable and fair exchange of labor for labor. You work in one field—we in another.—We would exchange productions upon fair and honorable terms. We sell you our labor, but we also purchase yours. This is fair. The only question is, do we bring you an article which you need and ought to have? This shall be our high and steady aim. How we may succeed is for you to decide.

A few, we are happy to say *a very few*, tell us they "have not *time* to read the Harbinger." Alas alas! We are curious to know how such people spend the 24 hours of each day, and especially of Sunday. Not time to feed the soul with even one morsel per day! No wonder some are sick among us and ready to die. Consider, dear reader, what it is thus to starve our religious nature. How many hours do we spend on the body—and yet not one hour to spare for the mind and the heart! Do we reflect that our religious nature needs nourishment as well as our physical? That we must feed the spirit as regularly as we do the body? How can we be strong in faith and valiant in fight if we starve our souls and withhold from them the aliment of life! We should *take* time for meditation, for prayer, for worship, for other means of spiritual culture, else we shall become lean and ill favored as the kine which in Pharoah's vision, betokened the dearth and famine of the land, work less, sleep less, eat less, idle

less,—do anything and everything less, sooner than go about with a poor, miserable half-starved soul—with no vigor for the service of God, and no sweet relish for the things of the spirit.

Some are too poor! Well, poverty is, indeed, a deep calamity. To want and to have nothing wherewith to get;—to hunger and thirst, and find no supply; to know that there are sweet streams of life flowing in the land and find no means of coming to their waters,—this is sad and sorrowful indeed. But yet the Lord loveth the poor and he does not forget them. To such he will send the blessings of his spirit in many a token, if indeed they be truly hungry for the true manna. Yet we fear there are many, who deceive themselves by this plea of poverty. They are not able to buy every gratification their hearts can desire perhaps—this is the case with most of us,—we all have to suffer some privation, but the question is what privation do we prefer? The price of a good religious quarterly or monthly or weekly is not much. Not more than that of a pair of gloves, or a month's consumption of tobacco, or some other little thing of animal comfort, and when the question comes up to the pleader of poverty, which will you forego on this plea, the carnal or the spiritual enjoyment, how do we decide? Woe to us if our inability—our poverty is for the spiritual, and our abundance only for the carnal!

Still there may be a few, actually unable to afford even the small cost of one of our religious newspapers, and who yet greatly desire the comfort and instruction which they could afford them. This is indeed a sad case. And will not the neighbors and friends of such help them to the pleasure? We have heard the appeal of some such and have not turned them away empty. Neither will we in the future. Let the application come fairly and in earnest, and we shall be more than willing to meet it.

We will not linger on this introduction. It is needles to do so. Every month we shall greet you, reader, and thus under a better acquaintance, court your good will. In courtesy and kindness present us to your neighbors and help us to a favorable introduction to those who have heads to instruct and hearts to improve. In mutual forbearance and good will let us commune together and seek, by study and meditation to know the will of the Lord more perfectly, that we may go on to perfection in his service. W. K. P.

NEW TRANSLATIONS OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

The demand for new translations of the Word of God, is so entirely in harmony with the spirit of freedom and inquiry, and of the advanced state of light in all fields of human knowledge, of the present day in the Christian world, that it is only surprising that enlightened men should be found endeavoring to resist this inevitable tendency. It is to refuse to-day what was granted in the past—to call that wrong now which we call right then. It is evident, however, that the opposition is losing ground. Men everywhere refuse any longer to be terrified by the idle voice of ecclesiastical alarm, based on unreasonable and tyrannous weakness of faith. There are men,—and these not a few, —everywhere, who know that they now clearly understand this question of the necessity, right, duty, and ability of the Christian people of to-day, of giving better translations of the Bible than the past has transmitted to us. The salient points in this controversy have been too well-defined and clear, to allow free, enlightened, thinking, faithful men any longer to be deterred by any such voices of fearful alarm, or dictating authority. Men know that the versions of the past are not, in many respects, what they ought to be for this day;—this is really beyond controversy. There is not a free, enlightened man that does not acknowledge errors of considerable consequence in these old versions. Every Commentary testifies to this. Moreover, we feel *this* great truth in our hearts, of which no man shall rob us,—that the Bible is *ours*; that it does not belong to any church, as ecclesiastical property, to be by it given to men as it pleases to give, but that it belongs as a divine gift to every man. It is mine, it is yours, Christian brother, and we need not go any where to receive it of any human authority, political or ecclesiastical, as a precious gift. We have a right, and feel it a duty for ourselves and the world, to understand it without let or hindrance. The word of God is not bound, and shall not be bound. That this conviction is gaining ground over the Protestant world, every day demonstrates more and more. The history of the last fifteen years in our own land, shows that there are myriads here who are thoroughly imbued with this conviction, and have shown it most evidently by their deeds. In spite of every effort either to ignore or affect to despise this question, it is forcing itself with increasing power on the attention of men in high places. In Europe, too, that world of great learning, free thought, and mighty intellectual activity, men are advancing to this great Bible work. Voices are heard in all directions, more or less clear, encouraging it. In England and on the Continent, learned and faithfully pious men are addressing themselves

vigorously to this task. The first fruits of these labors in America and Europe, in the English and other tongues, are already before us. We hail these with unfeigned pleasure, if not as perfected works, at least as tokens of a great and precious work, that, by the grace of God, this age will accomplish for the world. The impulse to this comes from too deep, exhaustless, and powerful a source to die out.

We know that it is constantly said, 'None of these versions will be satisfactory to all branches of the church, or be accepted by them.' This objection is urged not only by the steady opponents of new translations or revisions, but is deeply felt even by many of those who cannot but advocate the right and duty of this work, and are contributing to urge it on. Many of these stagger considerably at the question,—'but will the Christian world accept this or that version when made, assuming it to be a correct one?' This is regarded as a very troublesome question. Now, we do not for a moment doubt the truth of the statement made in the above objection. We have no idea that any translation, however excellent and superior to the common version, would be in any sense generally received by the various religious parties. He that expects and waits for such a propitious day, may rest assured that he waits in vain. No such day is at hand, or even, so far as any man can judge, in the future. Such a hope may once for all be given up. A prominent religious journal of a late date says, "But in the present condition of the church and the world, we have serious doubts whether any effort to produce a version which would be satisfactory to all branches of the church would be successful;" and we may add, 'truthful,'—and say that we more than fully share this doubt. But, in reply, we would say, is this not true of many other great works which Christians feel it their duty to do?—how many of these are 'satisfactory to all branches of the church'? Or, what church or religious people of profound conscientious convictions will accept this rule for religious action,—wait till they can act to the approbation of all religious parties? Will the great religious parties do this with reference to their creeds?—did they do this? Will they wait for this 'auspicious day' with reference to their missionary enterprises,—to which they say the love of God constrains them, and to which they devote so much money and talents? Will the Calvinist parties wait with their great religious enterprises till they can act with the full, cordial, co-operative consent of the Arminians, and *vice versa?* We trow not! And herein lies the explanation of the whole matter. For ourselves, we say once for all, we look for and wait for no such hour of universal consent. We do not deem it necessary to the justification or success of the work. If we feel it our duty to labor for a better translation of the Holy Oracles, and are

assured that we have secured it, let us without hesitation or foolish fear use it. A unity of translation, however desirable, is not to be hoped for, is not indispensable, and practically does not now exist.—No religious party, in its commentaries, in its expositions of doctrine, its proofs and controversies, now refers to the common version as a resort and authority of the last instance; not one! And this conviction has now reached even the unlettered multitude. On debated questions,—and even when there is no debate, but when there is question about the true meaning of a passage, the unlettered even ask after the closer sense of the original. The common version, however time-honored, is not accepted as undisputed, final judge. And we say, so it really has always been since the reformation, among the more intelligent; and this very spirit of final reference only to the inspired original, has done a great good to the world, by leading inevitably to a perpetual examination of the original. This is good, and as it should be. This great fountain should be perpetually resorted to,—the more the better,—and should not, by the excellency of any translation, be allowed to lie neglected and forgotten. May that day never come!—and it will, it can, never come! In this place we may add that the daily more wide-spread and perpetually widening knowledge of the original of the Bible,—at least of that of the New Testament,—however imperfect it may be, will lead men more and more everywhere freely to refer to the fountain-head. This dissemination of a knowledge of the Greek language,—and no croaking of uneducated ignorance, we rejoice to believe, can stop the study of this tongue,—is a mighty safe-guard to the original of the New Testament, and against false translations. Let men wisely ponder this fact!

Again, we may now safely say, no bad translation can now possibly maintain any permanent, honorable life. Men may rest assured of this. The world is too wide awake; knowledge is too general and of too high a character; the tests of versions are too many and too mighty, to enable a bad production of this sort to live long. A translation of no character will soon go down before the effectual fires of devouring criticism that would open against it from all sides. No matter how it might flatter a party; every party would have to yield before exposures of palpable, unsupportable errors. This is certain. These are days of thorough siftings; the winnowing-shovel is in too many hands. And we devoutly thank God that it is so. It may arouse the seven sleepers, alarm the lazy, but will neither disquiet nor terrify the brave and faithful. With this conviction, then, which we firmly entertain, and we think every thoughtful man must entertain that only good translations will maintain their ground, what fear is there even of multiplying these? No doubt no two such would be

precisely alike. This again is never to be looked for. Perhaps no two men live of the best Greek and English scholars, that separately, would give two English versions, though they should be true ones, fac similes in word and phrase of each other from one end of the New Testament to the other. If what the objectors say is true, that any good new version would only show but little difference from the old,—would this tend to disturb the confidence of Christians in the Word of God; or would it not rather confirm it and quiet fearful misapprehensions? Surely there is some good sense shown in the few words of introduction in the Nov. number of the *Theological Eclectic*, to a revision of the Epistle to the Romans by several English scholars, published in that valuable Monthly, when it says, that "It (this new version) will tend to reassure the minds of those who may have become distrustful of the authorized version." However we may differ with the writer of these words as to the eminent accuracy of the authorized version (and we have great reverence for it every way), yet with him we feel that good and faithful versions will only establish the confidence of Christians in the Divine Word. One uniform version for all, and accepted by all of one speech, may not now be attainable; and this is certain, the Common Version cannot be that one. How absurd to talk of the '*authorized* version,' to religious denominations who never acknowledged the British King who alone did so authorize it, as having any religious authority over them, and especially to us Americans who never acknowledged his dominion in any sense? Such, however, is the power of habit and inclinations.

Will this or that translation now looked for or demanded be *perfect?* This, if taken in the highest sense of the word, is more than any can or may hope for. *Perfection* is a high goal; to few, if to any, will it ever be given to attain to it. But if this is beyond our present hope, let us at least press forward to this mark, aiming at the best possible attainable end. While we urge on this work without hesitation, in full confidence of its need, of our right and duty to enter upon it; while we would labor to remove all unjust fears and objections, we would also at the same time, seek to save any from unreasonable, extravagant expectations, for men are ever prone to rush to extremes.

As announced in the programme for this volume of the *M. Harbinger*, we expect to give attention to this question of Translations of the Bible. Several specimens are before us for review, especially the translation of the New Testament by H. T. Anderson. But before proceeding more directly to the especial questions of what a translation ought to be, and what are the merits and demerits of these before us, we desire to clear the way by making the preceding remarks on the general question of translations of the Holy Scriptures.

In the next number we shall first attend, as we are able, to the question of what a translation of the New Testament ought to be; and then, applying what we shall have to say, to the versions before us, endeavor to examine them as critically and as profitably as we can. In the meantime we recommend our readers to examine the translalations of the New Testament by the Bible Union and by H. T. Anderson, and that of the Epistle to the Romans, above referred to, made by Dean Alford and four other scholars, and compare these with each other and with the Common Version. C. L. L.

SKETCHES FROM A PASTOR'S PORT-FOLIO.—NO. IX.

TRIALS AND DELIVERANCES.

We return to the diary of Eusebius:

I am conscious of peculiar solemnity and tenderness of soul, in recording events in which the hand of God has been wonderfully manifested. For months past my diary has been neglected, in consequence of the crowd of exciting incidents that have thronged about my path. I pause now to make a brief record of them, and to raise an Ebenezer in my pilgrim path, in grateful witness of the help of God.

Some six months ago, it became painfully evident that my ministry was unfruitful. There were no conversions. The prayer-meetings greatly decreased in size and interest. My Sabbath ministrations, although well attended, were nearly powerless. The subtle sympathies between a speaker and his hearers, which all public speakers know, but cannot easily define, conveyed to me a sense of defeat in my most determined efforts. An increasing levity in speech and manner was apparent among the younger members of the church. A few of the more aged and steadfast in the church, united with me in the observance of special seasons of fasting and prayer. None of us was aware of any special sin cherished in our midst; but there was a deep feeling that some Achan was in the camp—some golden wedge, and shekels of silver, and Babylonish garment hidden in our midst, that stayed the progress of victory. With many tears and supplications and heart-searchings, did we beseech God to reveal our wicked ways, strip us of every false trust, and at whatever cost of *present* suffering or humiliation, purge us of dross, that the pure gold, divinely wrought into acceptable forms, might beautify his sanctuary. Ah! how little do we know what we are praying for! Could we gain even a glimpse of the discipline and trial which our prayers are preparing for us, how often would the tongue be palsied in its utterances! We dream not of the humiliations, losses, conflicts, and fiery trials through which

our Father will lead us—of the terrible baptism of sufferings, out of which alone we can emerge with a meetness for the blessings which we ask. But let me not anticipate. For weeks we continued our supplications—watching the heavens for a sign of rain; but no cloud appeared. The heavens over us were brass, and the earth under us iron. While thus waiting and watching, I was led into an unusually severe inquisition into my own life, personal and ministerial. I began to fear that I had been daubing with untempered mortar: that the voice of popular fear had, unconsciously to myself, soothed me into contentedness with a kind of preaching, which only played with witching power about the fancy, and left the heart and conscience undisturbed. I came gradually to a sense of the *distance* of my preaching from my hearers. It was to them like the waves of sheet-lightning, rolling up in harmless grandeur upon the rim of the distant horizon. Its boldest attempts at rebuke or expostulation, were but a brilliant leap of forked lightnings, through remote clouds, which they could watch with admiration, and fear no harm to themselves. I cannot express the shame and humiliation that possessed me as I awoke to a consciousness of these facts, and convinced myself that the enemy of souls had cajoled me into a partial betrayal of my trust. I saw that the amiability of spirit which I had long and assiduously cultivated, with a view to repress a too ardent and impetuous nature, was running into such an extreme as to unfit me for the sterner task of reproof and rebuke. All that the stern old prophets said about "dumb dogs," and unfaithful pastors, rolled like thunder over my troubled conscience — Elijah and John, in their shaggy mantles, and lone grandeur, launching thunderbolt after thunderbolt against the pride and wickedness of men, were haunting my dreams and my waking hours. Occasionally I caught myself springing from troubled sleep, uttering the words of the prophet, *Cry aloud; spare not; lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins.*

I began, therefore, to look in real earnest into the moral and spiritual condition of my hearers, to see what demands lay on me for more faithful dealing. I was not long in learning some of my derelictions, nor slow to feel the startling power of the discovery. My attention was called to two of the members of the church—young men of good reputation—who had been betrayed into drunkenness. I found them in great distress of mind—ready to acquiesce in every word I spoke of the shame and perils of this vice. But when I pressed them to reveal to me the steps by which they had been led to the brink of this precipice, I received a lesson at their hands which I shall never forget. They said they had been betrayed through a simple insensibil-

ity to danger; that the two wealthy distillers of the place were liberal patrons of the church; that a respectable saloon-keeper, with his family, were constant attendants at church, and rented one of the most fashionable pews; that at weddings and on other festive occasions, their pastor did not refuse to share somewhat in the convivialities, even to wine-drinking; that they had heard from the pulpit none but very general words of warning as to the dangers of intemperance: they had therefore listened to the voice of the siren, without a proper knowledge of their perils. This was not said reproachfully, nor with a view to self-justification. It was spoken reluctantly, and mingled with many self-reproaches. I had never before received such a lesson. Freely did I confess to them my sad failure in duty; and with mutual confessions and tears we sought unto the Lord for pardon for the past, and strength for the future.

The next day was our covenant meeting. These brethren appeared and made voluntary confession of their sin. There were many tears, for they were much respected. One of our oldest members—himself rather "given to wine"—rose and administered a stern rebuke to the offenders, in a spirit which seemed to me to partake more of the severity of the law than of the compassion of the gospel. I rose immediately, and said, without referring to the remarks of the last speaker, that I had myself a confession to make: that these brethren had gone astray less through any weakness of their own, than through the evil example and unfaithfulness of their seniors: that the pulpit had failed in its duty on this question: that minister and people, by silent acquiescence, had approved of the opening of fountains of vice whose streams of death were now pouring in on us; and by example had encouraged the use of intoxicating drinks on festive and social occasions, when there was no plea of necessity to justify it. For myself, I must ask these brethren to forgive me my unfaithfulness. This course on my part seemed to startle the church, especially as it was accompanied with an announcement that my next sermon would be on the evils and dangers of intemperance. But little more was said or done, beyond receiving the wanderers back to the fold, with many demonstrations of forgiving love.

Sabbath.—A crowded house, and an evident mixture of curiosity and anxiety as to the coming sermon. I had sought, in humble confession and earnest prayer, to nerve my soul to courage for what I felt to be, in our community, a desperate undertaking. Even my chosen friends, who had been praying with me for the discovery and removal of our sins, came to warn me of the ruinous consequences of my temerity, to myself and to the church. But God had led me into an acquaintance with my duty, in a way that left me no doubt; and I set

my face like a flint. The makers and venders of strong drink were before me in bold array.

I read the thirty-third chapter of Ezekiel. After some general remarks on the duties of the ministry—especially the duty of the watchmen on the walls of Zion to warn the people of danger, and thus deliver their own souls, I proceeded to discourse plainly of the mischief and ruin wrought by intemperance to the individual, to the family, to the general interests of the community, and to the interests of the church. Its awful statistics of poverty, crime and ruin were given. Coming to our own town, I gave publicity to many facts in my possession:—the drunkenness engendered in our social parties; the inebriety which was becoming notorious in connection with fashionable cotillion parties; the fearful reign of dissipation in our political campaigns; the shame that had already come to many homes; and the recklessness that was rapidly spreading among the youth of our village. An earnest appeal was made to manufacturers and venders, in view of the ruinous results of their business; to the public at large, in view of the wide-spread mischiefs of this vice; and to Christians, in view of the holiness of their calling, to unite in efforts to drive back this traffic into legitimate channels, for necessary uses; to banish drinking habits from society, and dry up this fountain of crime and wretchedness.

The effects of this discourse were various. Some greatly rejoiced in my boldness, and could not refrain, during the delivery of the sermon, from encouraging ejaculations. Some, who had been great sufferers, sobbed aloud. A few of the guilty hung their heads in shame. Many timid ones were alarmed, as red-hot sentences of rebuke succeeded each other, and fell with burning efficacy on the heads of guilty parties. Others were greatly displeased,—especially the makers of the silver shrines, who felt that their craft was in danger, and the leaders in the revels of the town, two or three of whom were marked specimens of the combination of intellectual strength and moral imbecility—of exterior grace with internal deformity and vileness.—There were some signs of a coming storm. In a little while it burst in a tempest of popular indignation on my head. The village resounded with the insane cry, *Great is Diana of the Ephesians.* The patronage of all connected with the craft was instantly withdrawn from the church. Insulting and threatening letters poured in on me. The whole populace was in agitation, like the storm-swept sea, and there was foam on the crest of many a billow, and anger in the dash of the waves against the shore. The most annoying part of it was the course of certain *toadies* in the church, who feared to offend the men of wealth on one hand, and the men of character in the church, on the other. It was both amusing and provoking to see them try to trim their sails, and tack about, every hour, to escape contrary winds.

To members of the church they would "damn with faint praise" the sermon whose doctrine they dared not disavow; to the shrine-makers, they would deplore the radicalism of their pastor, express their wish that he would confine his sermons to theology, and not meddle with these exciting topics, where so much could be said on both sides. To be sure, intemperance was a great evil—nobody doubted it; but then—— and then—— and then: and so these popularity-worshipers sought the favor, and earned the contempt, of all parties.

Having done my duty, I quietly waited for the salvation of God; taking not the least notice of the opposition, except by following up the first discourse with additional arguments and appeals, calmly, but firmly and earnestly delivered. It was not many weeks until the storm was stilled. One of the most promising young men in the town, in a drunken frolic, while attempting to ascend the stairs to his room at the hotel, fell over the banisters, and broke his neck. His agonized parents sent for me to conduct the funeral services. Amid the hush of passion occasioned by this calamity, my voice was heard more favorably. The wax was melted. Saving impressions were readily made. Over the wreck of a manly form, I spoke to the awakened sympathies of the populace, as, I am persuaded, it was never before given to me to speak. In less than a week, an aged and wealthy citizen was found frozen to death by the road-side, where he had fallen in helpless intoxication. Again I was summoned to speak over a drunkard's grave, by a family that had been loud in denunciation of my sermon. The revolution in public sentiment was deep and powerful, and came much sooner than I had anticipated. I received a written invitation, signed by many prominent citizens who had been zealous in opposition to my course, to repeat the discourse at an early day. I was to reap in joy what I had sown in tears. Now, thanks to Him *who stilleth the noise of the seas, and the tumults of the people*, we are reaping the blessed fruits of a renovated public sentiment.—Never had I such power in the pulpit as now.

But there came other trials and other blessings. A sermon on the sin of Achan had led to revleations which put in my hands some threads of a tangled mesh of facts and circumstances, which, as I proceeded quietly to unravel, guided me to the discovery of a genuine Achan in our host. It became evident that one of our office bearers—a man of considerable reputation for piety and benevolence, had lent himslf to a series of deceptions and wrongs, of a most flagrant character. It involved the alteration of figures in his day-book—the denial of his own signature,—and the obtaining of money under false pretences: all of which, owing to the odor of his sanctity, he had been able to accomplish with but slight suspicion of wrong. He had

altered his accounts, in a Sabbath afternoon, after returning from worship; and had gone, the same evening, to bear a large basket of provisions to a suffering family! Such are the inexplicable contradictions of a life in which the good and bad are stoutly contending for the mastery. It is awful to think of the blinding and corrupting power of sin in the souls of men. At the very time that I held in my hand unmistakable evidences of this man's repeated sins against truth and honesty, he came to me with a bitter complaint against two young members who had been guilty of the terrible crime of dancing, and another whom he had actually surprised in the heinous sin of novel-reading. He insisted that *these* were the hidden sins of Achan, and that the church would never prosper, until her garments were cleansed from these foul pollutions! Thus, he who had daily to do with the devil, pretended to be frightened at a mouse. Was this self-deception, or the impudence of willful hypocrisy?

This was a trying case. The standing of the offender—the turpitude of the wrongs—a numerous and influential circle of relatives in the church, some of whom must testify against him—and the shame before the world, of such a revelation: all these made it a painful and difficult case to manage. It looked as if a faithful course must result in the ruin of the church, for a time at least. Through a proper course of investigation, the facts in this case were elicited, and brought to the knowledge of the church. A committee of brethren of great prudence, and possessing great weight of character, had patiently unraveled the whole affair, and presented it to the church, with the sanction of their names, in such candor, and with such evident sorrow and shame over the evidence of flagrant and cruel wrong, that, high as the delinquent had stood in the church, not a voice was raised in his favor. A fearful struggle was evidently going on in his own breast.—He rose, much excited, to speak in his own defense. Fearing the consequences to himself, should he publicly deny or evade the facts in the case, I asked him to pause while I made a proposition to the church. In view of the eternal consequences likely to flow from the answer made to these charges, I proposed that he be requested to delay his remarks for one week, the whole church meanwhile uniting in earnest prayer in his behalf, that he might be delivered from the snare of the devil. This was heartily adopted. During the week I saw him alone, and faithfully laid before him the consequences of covering his sins.

At our next meeting, this man came forward, and frankly confessed his guilt; revealed the awful conflicts of soul through which he had passed; made known other wrongs which he had, during the week, repaired, amounting to several thousand dollars of accumulated gains,

dishonestly secured; thanked the church for their faithfulness and tenderness; resigned his office; expressed agonizing doubts of the possibility of his salvation; and finally said that he could not even ask to be retained in membership in a church which he had so grievously dishonored. This was given, in broken utterances, and amidst convulsions of feeling which even his strong manhood could not control. Although two or three were for excluding him from the church, the general sentiment was very decided, to accept his resignation of office, but to retain him still in our fellowship, and pray God if peradventure the purposes of his heart might be forgiven him.—It was a deeply sorrowful hour. There seemed, when this case was disposed of, a sort of stupor resting on the whole church, like that which results from a stunning blow. We sat in silence for some time —a silence broken only by the groans of this unhappy man, or the ebullitions of feeling among the weeping assembly. Soon, however, other members rose to confess their faults. The young members who had been so sternly reproved for frequenting the halls of gayety, were moved more by his penitential sorrows than they had been by his harsh censures. They feelingly expressed their sense of the injury they had done to their own souls and to the church of God, by abandoning their hearts to the frivolous pleasures of the world, and stated that the revelations of this hour had taught them that their laughter should be turned to mourning and their joy into heaviness. Two excellent brethren, who, with their families, had been much alienated, were publicly reconciled. A general confession followed from all who felt that they had been failing in duty. Our meeting closed with tearful utterances of thanks to God who had torn, and was healing us; who had smitten, and was binding us up.

Here, I fondly hoped, our troubles would end, and our prayers for deliverance find a complete fulfillment. But not yet were we ready for the Master's use. I began to think of the language of the prophet: *Moab hath been at ease from his youth, and is settled on his lees, and hath not been emptied from vessel to vessel, neither hath he gone into captivity: therefore his taste remained in him, and his scent is not changed.** I. E.

The pleasure which affects the human mind with the most lively and transporting touches is the sense that we act in the eye of infinite wisdom, power, and goodness, that will crown our virtuous endeavors here with a happiness hereafter, large as our desires, and lasting as our immortal souls; without this the highest state of life is insipid, and with it the lowest is a paradise.

---

* Jer. xlviii. ii.

"DENOMINATIONAL ASPECTS."

This is the heading of a short article signed "J. W. B." and published in "the Chronicle" of December 1st. 1864. "J. W. B." introduces his article by a short paragraph taken from an Editorial in a previous number of "The Chronicle." The paragraph is as follows :—

"That our views have always prevailed most where they have been most boldly set forth, and most clearly enunciated, is a well known fact, and should we go back to the position taken by our fathers, assume the aggressive, and go forth with the proselyting spirit of the great commission, we should, doubtless, see great changes in the public mind."—*Editor of Chronicle.*

On this opinion of the venerable Editor of the Chronicle, "J. W. B." thus enlarges :—

A volume of spiritual and historical truth may be gathered out of the preceding paragraph, which would tend to accelerate our progress as a denomination, if we would calmly and carefully learn its lessons. For a long time I have been deeply impressed with the unquestionable fact that Baptists do not command that influence over the public mind which their origin and practices demand. Believing as we do that we have the *truths* of the Gospel in their pure, unadulterated state, ought we not most assiduously to labor to give these truths the prominence which, at least, would command the respectful attention of the children of men. Do we not act as if we were fearful lest we should be found in error? By preaching the truths we hold dear, those truths which we fully believe are to be found in the Word of God, we can lose nothing, but, on the contrary, as well attested historical facts plainly prove, must gain in denominational strength, and hence, as a necessary result, there will be an increased concentration of spiritual power, which can be applied to the accomplishment of great moral results.—But some one may say: "We do preach Baptist truths. 'Tis true, we do not continually preach immersion, and construct labored arguments to prove the reasonableness and scripturalness of our—as it is unfortunalely termed—close communion; but we preach Jesus, and Him crucified, which is *the* great Biblical truth. I don't believe it is judicious to 'harp' so much on what are called 'Baptist truths.'" Such an absurd argument is frequently presented by those who term themselves Baptists. Now, I would not have one to preach every Sabbath, or "continually," on these distinctive tenets of our faith, any more than I would have one to discuss the doctrine of regeneration, *as a doctrine*, in every sermon; but as neither Jesus nor Paul has separated repentance, faith, and immersion, so let us not put "asunder what God hath joined together." Our duty is to preach the *whole* Gospel, and this question is not to be determined by asking ourselves, is it "judicious." It is said by others "that every one is sufficiently acquainted with our doctrines—that books on such subjects are plentiful and within easy access of every one. Is it true that our doctrines are "sufficiently" known? The fact, I am persuaded, is

just the reverse, and candor compels me to state, that so far as *my* observation testifies, there is a lamentable ignorance, even among those who are well informed upon other religious questions; and as to books, no doubt they are plentiful.—and so they are upon other questions, but do people examine them? No, they must be taught, and so it is with regard to immersion. What more appropriate place than the pulpit for the discussion of this gospel fact? We must not only wage a defensive war, but we must take the aggressive, and in the spirit of Jesus, go forth preaching "immersion for the remission of sins." We must take the position of our fathers, and enter upon our work in the spirit of true proselytes, not making men "two-fold more the children of hell," but rather making them "two-fold" more obedient. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." is the farewell injunction of Jesus to his disciples—to his church. "And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things that are written in this book," is also the almost closing declaration of holy writ. "If ye love me, keep my commandments." "Preach the Word."

J. W. B.

We are happy to see this opinion so earnestly and candidly expressed, and with apparent approbation by the editor, in the columns of "The Chronicle." Our readers will remember that some time last year, this same Chronicle thought it his duty to deal very unkindly and unfairly too with J. W. McGarvey's Commentary on Acts, simply because it gave an honest and fair and faithful criticism on the apostolic injunction, "Be immersed for the remission of sins." And now, with apparent approbation, he publishes an exhortation to preach, as a "denominational aspect," "immersion for the remission of sins"! "J. W. B.," speaking as a Baptist and setting forth a "denominational aspect," says: "We must not only urge a defensive war, but we must take the aggressive, and in the spirit of Jesus, go forth preaching 'immersion for the remission of sins.'" This is good, but better far if the Baptists would heed the exhortation, and throw their might with us in preaching the gospel in the good old apostolic style of the Acts.

We say this in no party spirit, nor with a view of claiming precedence in the use of the divine method of bringing men to Christ, and a sense of the forgiveness of their sins;—but from a desire to see the authority of the Scriptures honored, and the power of the gospel brought directly to the consciences of the people. If we would succeed as the apostles did, we must preach as they did.

If denominationalism is justified at all, it is because it stands out for some principle or practice that is vital to the success of the gospel, and which others have neglected or perverted. And why should such principle or practice be treated with neglect, in our preaching, save upon the policy of a cowardly compromise with error? I know

there is danger sometimes of making a hobby of a "denominational aspect," until it becomes disgusting; but there is no danger in treating any element or ordinance of the economy of grace, just as the apostles treated it. We cannot err while we follow the divine models, nor utter false guidance, in repeating and enforcing the words of the "living oracles."

It is now as it has ever been,—tradition corrupts the truth. The old work of the Rabbis is ever repeated. Modern Phariseeism, like the old, is ever seeking some better way, to the neglect or perversion of the divine commandments. Doubtless if our Savior were present at some of the homilies which fashionable denominationalism is daily dealing out on "the commission," he would demand again, as of old, "Why do ye transgress my commandments by your traditions?"—For when one *makes of no effect* the command "Be immersed for the remission of sins," is it not confessedly by the authority of tradition? No one at all regardful of his reputation for scholarship, pretends now to say that there is either apostolic precept or example for *infant* baptism, or for the substitution of sprinkling or pouring for immersion. The argument for these destructive substitutes rests entirely on inference and custom. And are not these the foundation stones of tradition? Tradition is to a divine ordinance as the *common law* is to a *positive statute*. The common law is the generalization of custom, and custom becomes *law*, simply because it has the authority of human practice. Men, whether through a single judge or many, decide to act in a given case in a certain way;—this makes a precedent, and this, oft repeated, grows into a law. But the stream can never rise above the fountain. At last, the authority is that of the human judgment. So also with tradition. It is only what men have inferred and consecrated by practice. But as a *positive statute* is higher than any power of custom, and cannot be lawfully subverted by it, so are the divine commands higher than tradition, and cannot be made void by them.

In the Christian religion, which is a positive institution, therefore, no matter what men may have inferred or done, if it subverts or changes any positive ordinance of the divine founder, it is to be opposed by every faithful preacher of the word. The more firmly the innovation may have become fixed in the practice of men, so much greater, precisely, the necessity for earnest and unremitted effort to overthrow and eradicate it. The sin of a tradition is that it renders void a divine commandment. The more effectually it does this, the greater the sin. A tradition that commands no respect can do but little harm. It is, therefore, the most respectable traditions that deserve to be treated with greatest disrespect. It is this respectability that we must overthrow if we would destroy their power.

That immersion, and immersion only, is Christian baptism, is unquestionably a "denominational aspect" of the Baptists;—but is it not lamentably true that they give but very little prominence to this feature, in their public proclamation of the gospel? While it may be truly said, that their belief on this subject is generally known, it is perhaps equally true that their silence as to its importance produces the impression that they hold it after all as a matter of but very little consequence. People will, almost unconsciously it may be, but still they will reason and practically conclude, that, where there is a known and most striking difference between two denominations of professing Christians, which they themselves studiously cover up, and avoid to discuss:—they will conclude that this difference is after all of no moment, and may be treated with the same indifference by the world that it receives from the church. Practically this is the result. To-day, it is true that the Baptists are largely to blame that there is any respect shown by the world to infant baptism, to sprinkling or pouring. Let it be heard every Lord's day in the year, in every Baptist pulpit through the land, that these things are traditions—practices of human origin, and not only without divine warrant, but in subversion of one of the most significant ordinances of the New Testament, and we shall see a revolution in public sentiment and practice on this subject that will surprise even the most sanguine.

If the difference between a Baptist's view of baptism and that of Pædobaptists is worthless, why, in the name of union and good sense, let us away with it. Bury it forever out of sight as an heretical abomination. What excuse can we have for dividing the Lord's people by questions that tend only to strife, and which are worthless, no matter how settled? But on the other hand, if this difference be founded in the divine appointment, if it is the difference between fidelity to a divine ordinance and the disloyal substitution in its place of a human tradition, then let us make no compromise—declare no truce—but push the distinction to the sharpest verge of controversy, till the error is corrected, the evil overthrown, and the truth left alone to hold the convictions and demand the obedience of the people.

But what is the reason that the Baptists, as a denomination, are so lukewarm in the defense of immersion? Why do they draw a mantle over this distinctive feature, and smother it up under the ample folds of a general orthodoxy? Is it not because they have themselves associated with the question a tradition of their own, that renders the very ordinance virtually void? Have they not degraded this profoundly significant *symbol* into a mere *ceremony*;—pushed it off its divine pedestal, as an *ordinance*, to the place of a meaningless *rite*—and, separating it from its *design*, taken from it, at the same time, the *value*

of its observance? Make immersion an idle ceremony—a useless rite—an act without a design—and you not only degrade the ordinance, but excite the contempt of the people for the preacher that insists on the necessity of submitting to it. "J. W. B.," we doubt not, sees this as clearly as we do, and hence the conviction which he so manfully expresses in the article above:—"We must not only wage a defensive war, but we must take the aggressive, and in the spirit of Jesus, go forth preaching 'immersion for the remission of sins.'"—O, that the Baptists would do this! that in all their strength of numbers, and zeal, and piety, and learning, they would declare for this great declaration of the first preacher in his first sermon to the inquiring penitents of Pentecost, and set their faces like flints to the steel of controversy, till this spark of truth shall flash into all eyes, and we come to see alike on this portal ordinance of the kingdom of the Messiah! W. K. P.

A SHORT SERMON FOR THE TIMES.

Knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep.—Rom. xiii: 2.

There are duties growing out of the times we live in—duties owing to the age in which God has assigned us our lot. Ages of persecution called forth the *passive* virtues: often it was the strength of the saints to sit still. Our age makes demands on the *active* virtues cheifly. Some ages give amplitude as well intensity to certain precepts. "Parents, bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," has a much broader significance now than in apostolic times: that is, the opportunties for high intellectual, moral and spiritual culture which are now enjoyed, will not allow us to stop where necessity compelled most of the primitive disciples to stop in the education of their offspring. The command to "hold forth the word of life" requires a thousand times more of us than of the primitive church. Not more in *desire*—not more in self-consecration to the work; but more in *results*. In an age of free speech, and free press, of wondrous inventive and facile enterprise, with a net-work of railroads over vast empires, steam-vessels plowing the seas, telegraphic wires almost girdling the world, Science and Art multiplying with more than mag ical power, the facilities for overcoming time, space, and feebleness—making a race of demigods out of the frail children of dust: all these give us a thousand-fold increase of *ability* to spread the light of salvation over the earth. We state, then,

I. That these are times of progress in physical science, in the practical arts, and in intellectual culture, when the stewards of God's

gifts will be required to make large returns. The servant with one talent who merely hid his lord's money, was a saint in comparison with the man of this age who, with a thousand talents, would content himself with returning the profits of one.

II. These are *money-making* times.

We present the singular spectacle of a government loading itself with a debt almost hopelessly enormous, while the people, in the midst of the desolations of war, are growing rich with unparalleled rapidity. Every branch of trade and commerce is quickened into unusual life: new paths of enterprise are opening on every hand. The earth is unlocking her immense treasure-houses of lead, copper, silver and gold; rivers of unctious wealth are pouring forth in augmenting abundance in the oil regions; government contracts open chances for wealth which, were there no peculation, must still pour in steady streams of gain through channels unknown in times of peace. Many Christians, as well as many rogues, are growing rich—some enormously wealthy. All true men among them *must increase their benefactions a hundred or a thousand fold*, or they are ruined. To delay—to dally with the golden bribe, will be fatal. "The King's business requires haste." The spell of covetousness once woven about them, the voice of duty will be heard nevermore, only feebly and occasionally. "Be ready to distribute—willing to communicate:" thus only can a good foundation be laid against the time to come.

III. They are *distressing* times.

We pause not to speak of the distress which has been brought to ten thousand homes by the loss of precious lives—a distress which no human power can heal. But of that which is *curable*. There are multitudes of widows and orphans almost homeless and penniless.—There are many maimed and shattered soldiers, unfit for any active calling, and rendered objects of Christian charity not more by their loss of limb, than by their loss of virtue; thrown upon community to be redeemed by Christian kindness, or to infect society with the vices of camp life. And then the throngs of ghastly sufferers in our hospitals, in need of many physical comforts, as well as of intellectual and spiritual food. Then think of the two millions of freedmen thrown on the sympathy of the world by the violent revolution which war has occasioned: ignorant, unprovided, incapable of managing successfully for themselves, and doomed to contend with many sinful but popular prejudices and passions. We see it estimated by a gentleman familiar with the benevolent agencies set on foot in behalf of the freedmen, that fully *one-half* of them are likely to perish from want. In the state of things violently superidduced by war, it is impossible that arrangements can be suddenly *improvised* to meet these vast

wants. In addition to all that government can do, there is a large field for the most active and genuine benevolence of all Christians. There is a wild Italian legend, that the Savior still lingers upon the earth, and appears annually, among a crowd of mendicants, at the gates of Rome. Is this all fable, think you?

Then what *spiritual* distress is in the land. How the ways of Zion mourn! How is the fine gold of the sanctuary dimmed! What apostacies! What grievous backslidings! What forgetfulness of God! How the multitudes are thronging the ways of death! Never was there such need for bold, stirring, laborious, self-denying ministers of the Word. Where are they?

IV. They are *exciting* times.

War times must be so—especially times of civil war. Every passion is stirred. Every interest is touched. There is license and temptation for every kind of wickedness. The agitations of society throw to the surface much, unknown before, of the awful depravity of the human heart. Then these are *revolutionary* times. Old ideas and institutions are yielding to new ones. Nations are sloughing off the dead forms of the past. Not only in this country, but in Europe, this is true. Look at Italy.

There is a whitening harvest on fields that have been enriched with the tears and blood of the saints and martyrs of God. In other countries, where the fact is less apparent, there are, ever and anon, earthquake heavings which give warning of the pent-up energies which are yet to break forth in revolutionary power—either to elevate the nations to greater freedom, or deluge them with the just judgments of God. We have no room here to speak of France, Austria, England, and the German Principalities. But "the sea and the waves are roaring." Is the Lord coming? or, after a baptism of fire, are we to see the millennial day? In either case, *Watch!*

V. These are times of excitement and times of *danger*. The soul is off its guard. Prayer ceases. Bad passions triumph. The love of many waxes cold. Infidelity seizes the time to creep, in snaky subtlety, into the hearts of men; and when bad passions are rampant, truth is always ungainly, and error is always welcome. Take care! And when the enemy comes in like a flood, let the Spirit of the Lord, through His devoted and faithful saints, lift up a standard against him.

In a word, these are times which call for a burnishing of our armor —a re-harnessing for the fight—a double portion of the spirit of the Master—greatly increased benevolence—the waking up of the whole church out of sleep—and an outlay of means and effort commensurate

with the dangers of the hour, the difficulties to be overcome, and the grandeur of the mission that is given to the saints.

Let the year on which we enter bear witness to a mighty increase of the power and efficiency of the church of God. The Judge standeth at the door. I. E.

FRATERNAL LETTERS—NO. 2.

Dear Brethren of —— Church:—Two months have elapsed since the date of my last letter. During the interval, I have received intelligence of numerous additions to your happy fold, and your acknowledgment of indebtedness for the kindly suggestions contained in that letter. From these considerations, I am inclined more than ever to address you again, hoping that what I write may not be entirely unavailing in any effort you may make to reach a higher degree of Christian perfection. In the previous letter, it was my endeavor to make obvious the existence of special capacity for good, on the part of every member of your body, and the *necessity* of concert of action in order to accomplish any important Christian work. That all congregational strength or ability is the result of a union of individual strength or ability, possessed by the members of such congregation, is self-evident. And it is equally clear that the full measure of such united strength is only attained when the full measure of individual ability is reached, and the co-operation is complete and cordial. It becomes, therefore, a question of liveliest interest with you, in view of this congregational efficiency, to learn not only your *true place of usefulness* in the body, and *how such usefulness may be increased*, but also the *conditions essential to permanent and invigorated vitalization*, without which many among you will become, as were the Corinthians, "weak and sickly, and many sleep."

In reference to the first of these inquiries, we exceedingly regret that so barren are some congregations of all vitality, that the energetic and faithful disciple cannot well go amiss in laboring *any where and in all ways*, most profitably. For it is but one vast field, inviting to every kind of labor. In others again (and these are by far the most numerous), it requires on the part of the disciple some effort to discover *where* his labors are most needed, and *how* they will prove most effective. For their most obvious and pressing wants are mainly supplied. But there is yet another class, whose genuineness is certainly attested by the highest degree of vitality, and in which it becomes a most difficult and protracted task, even for the most devoted member, to find any room for the exercise of new or additional labor.

Such instances, though exceptional, do exist, and while they are the most delightful and gratifying pictures of fidelity to the greatest and best of causes, as regarded by the outside beholder, they are not entirely without painful awakenings to the zealous members within, as presenting no occasion to greater effort, and as constraining within too limited a compass the full measure of his capacity for good. Like a hive of busy bees (their true type), whose crowded cells are no longer commensurate with their capacity for labor, and are hence moved with deepest agitation to find elsewhere adequate scope. So these, ever earnest in their Master's cause, are moved with great anxiety to find more enlarged opportunities for the culmination of their usefulness. Whether in one or the other of these, you certainly owe to your congregation whatever of your ability, be it little or all, it can *absorb* in good works, looking either to its own upbuilding or the conversion of those without. It matters also but little of what kind this ability may be, as it is all the property of the church, to whatever extent it is employed for its interest, and you should never hesitate to accord it. In doing this, you are certainly in his *true place of usefulness*, so far as the body has the right or authority to appoint your duty or appropriate your talents. Above and beyond what your congregation may appoint, you have nevertheless a proper place to fill—one to which your own convictions, derived from God's Word, would impel you—a volunteer service in behalf of the whole body, prompted by that generoos principle against which there is no law, and leading to that highest development, expressed in Paul's letter to the Philippians, when he says, he was "willing to be offered upon the sacrifice and service of their faith." Neither is it necessary, in order to fill your place in such "free will offerings," that you continually render service in *one specific thing*, but in as *many things* as occasion may present—always doing all the good in every way you can. The hand may fill *well* its place in the body when it is providing and ministering support to the body, but it can do more. It can staunch the blood flowing from its wounds, or apply the sharp cautery to its tumors — It can enhance the pleasure of that body by kindling the comfortable fires of winter, or constructing the refreshing shades of summer, and it is only in doing all it can, that it fills completely its office in the body. The same is true of every other member of the human body. "Now you are the body of Christ and members in particular," and hence are something, whether named or not, and have a *place* which cannot be mistaken, for it is *wherever* you can "make increase of that body into the edifying of itself in love." If this conclusion be correct, our second inquiry finds just here an easy and safe answer. For we should never lose sight of the fact that such is the organization

of the mystical body of Christ, like that of our natural bodies, that each member, instead of its being weakened by its contributions to the body, is strengthened by reason of its strength, and farther enabled not only to repeat the same service, but even greater. The way therefore in which you may *increase* your capacity for usefulness, is by bending your energies to the advancement of the whole body, receiving in return constant supplies of invigorated strength.

Such is, then, the beautiful and wonderful machinery of the church, whose workings waste not away its several parts, but conspire perpetually to their augmentation. We may find pause in thankfulness for such gracious arrangements, but can never cease to wonder.—Borne in profound amazement to contemplate all its parts, and their harmonious co-operation, we cannot overlook the grand consideration of *that* which generates its motion, and impels to activity all its diversified parts. *What* is it? *Whence* comes this energizing power, and what the *conditions of its perpetuity?* All of these are questions worthy of the most profound reflection, and hence cannot be elaborated in the short compass of a single letter. Let me however briefly offer some suggestions on this interesting topic.

You are, as Christians, associated together by the authority of your great Head, Jesus Christ, for the regeneration of the world and the salvatton of yourselves. Independent of such authority, whatever of propriety or fitness there is in associations of animals of the same species, or in combinations of kindred particles of matter in one mass, a like fitness and propriety warrants your association. Among men and women, very greatly dissimilar, possessed of different natural endowments, different habits, dispositions and modes of thought, and having different aims, some change or modification must have taken place, or remodeling occurred, to establish identity, in order to a harmonious and consequently permanent union. Without such identity, experience has clearly taught the utter futility of any attempt to establish and maintain for any great period, any associations of our race.

This great metamorphosis takes place in the *new* birth, or is itself the new birth. Transformed to the same views, the same feelings, and the same state, it is as natural that they should be brought together under Christ their Lord, as that fragments of steele under the influence of attraction should be ranged around the magnet, or mountain rivulets under the influence of gravitation, mingle their kindred waters in one final stream. This new creation is the work of the Spirit, and is *energized and vivified by it.* "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." This new spiritual being, like all other creations, has life, and that life, though "hid with Christ in God," has its *conditions of permanent and invig-*

orated vitalization. What these conditions are, is a question of the greatest importance to the disciple, underlying as it does his enjoyment, his usefulness, and even his salvation. To live, simply, never was or can be satisfactory to the Christian. He wishes to live, as far as is possible in his present state, under the fullest enjoyment of all the blessings vouchsafed him by Heaven for his own aggrandizement and that of others. The mere understanding of the conditions upon which his vitality depends, is not his only aspiration, but to possess and cherish them in his very soul. Knowledg with him is important, but only so, as it is available in producing a life of holiness. Depending as we frequently do upon *occasion* to arouse within us the inspiring impulse of action, or upon *opportunity* to open up an easy and inviting channel through which to act, we are often led to hunt for and expect the true conditions of spiritual life in our outside surroundings, and to regard our spiritual status as greatly determined by these. As a consequence of such convictions, we are often found comparing ourselves and our condition with others around us, and are heard to say, "If I were as rich—if I enjoyed as great opportunities —if I had as happy a natural disposition—if I held such social position, as this or the other one, how much better, more devoted and happy I would be. There is certainly a capital error in all this. Shall we believe that our Heavenly Father has made so vital and stable a a thing dependent upon such incidental and precarious conditions?— Or that spiritual life should derive its pure and holy qualities and highest beatification from simple accidents of the flesh? To one of any observation and sober reflection, the fallacy of such a position is too striking to admit of argument.

In the history of our fallen race, the continuation and enjoyment of natural life, by reason of the vast disturbance in all organic life produced by sin, is precarious, and in many instances suspended on the barest contingency. But until these corruptions were wrought by sin, it was above and independent of any contingency, except such as man might and could have controlled. Even now the essential conditions are the same to all, and may be possessed by all, within those limitations where disease and death do not encroach. The same unchanging ordinances of nature sustain the life of the learned as well as the unlearned, the rich as well as the poor, unless voluntarily rejected, or barred in their vitalizing influences. Spiritual life certainly has its conditions, but they are uniform, and hence neither casual nor contingent. Paul and Silas in chains, enjoyed as true spiritual vitality as they ever could have enjoyed under the most comfortable circumstances of body imaginable. Our fortuitous surroundings are matters pertinently considered in all matters of *relative duty or obliga-*

tion, but cannot be regarded as affecting the abstract principle of spiritual life in the case of the true disciple of Christ. No fact is more clearly announced in the Bible, or one which we more fearfully affirm, than that God our Heavenly Father will hold us responsible for the use of every special and distinguishing endowment or circumstance adhering to us at the time of our introduction into the kingdom of Christ, or for the opportunities of doing good subsequently occurring. But that the influence which directs and controls the proper use of such things is generated by the things themselves, is simply absurd All they can ever do, is to hinder or favor the operation of such agencies, just to the extent that we *willingly* exalt them against or subordinate them to these agencies.

Between the conditions and laws of spiritual life (and we choose so to call it because "it is the spirit that quickeneth," and "that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit") and those known to sustain and regulate natural life, there are many striking analogies suggested in the New Testament. How far the great Author of both creations entertained the special purpose of making all material things, so that by the teaching of these He might give the world an understanding of things belonging to the higher and unseen creation, or whether this was the grand design and prime object of the present order, is a curious and instructive question. That "all things were created by" Jesus Christ "and *for him*," in some other sense than as answering the wants of a sensuous being, is clear from the fact that he was so poor in all these possessions, that he "had not where to lay his head." We can only see one other sense in which to understand this declaration, and that points to the use which He, as Sovereign and Lord, made these things to subserve. Be this as it may, of one thing we are fully assured, that without a knowledge of material things, we could not apprehend much the greater portion of what is taught in the New Testament. Not only does a correct acquaintance with the laws, qualities and habits of material things by which we are surrounded in this life, *aid* us in searching the meaning of Scripture teaching, but our knowledge of the one is very nearly proportioned in all cases to our attainment in the other. Prophetic symbols, the parables of our Savior, and the beautiful figurative teachings of the Epistles and Revelation, impart to us their significance through these sensuously apprehended things. All illustrations derive their force and energy from this source, and all we can predicate of the *higher life*, and the laws of its being and enjoyment, is derived from the analogies existing between it and natural life, which Jesus and the inspired Apostles employed to illustrate and enforce their teachings and writings. From these we learn that the life of man and the life

of the "*new creature*" are alike the direct gift of God. If one is sustained by the continual operation of God's power, so is the other. If this power is exerted through appropriate ordinances in behalf of one, it is also through wisely appointed ordinances in behalf of the other; and if one cannot exist independent of organs, neither can the other; and if the one receives its highest enjoyment under the maintenance of these organs, in all their divinely constituted relationships and adaptations to these ordinances, so equally does the other. In these respects one is the representative of the other, and hence what can be affirmed or denied, unless specially excepted in the word of God, of the one, may also be said of the other. As the natural man has organs of digestion, respiration and circulation, known as the stomach, lungs and heart, so the Christian has organs of faith, obedience and love, which we call the mind, the heart, and the conscience. In accommodation to this first class of natural organs, we have the air, food and blood; and to the latter class, the facts, commands and promises of the Gospel. These in each case are essential to life. The mind is a vital organ in the spiritual world, and faith as certainly results whenever it is brought under the influence of the facts of the gospel, as the lungs under atmospheric influence produce respiration. We know that no man can live without respiration, and the word of God declares that without faith the spiritual man is also dead. "The just shall *live* by faith." "Ye are the children of God by faith." Again, without love, the Christian would, according to Paul's judgment, be "nothing." The heart is the organ of love, and is affected, to produce this result, by the promises of the gospel. To this the testimony of Peter is very clear. For he says there "are given to us many great and precious promises, that *by these* we might become partakers of the divine nature," which nature is *love*. Also, the commands are received into our consciences, already cleansed by the blood of Christ, and obedience in all good sincerity is the result.—Were this not so, why would Paul say that from his forefathers he had *served* God with pure conscience? To serve him is to *obey* him. He tells Felix that he *exercised* himself "to have a conscience void of offense toward God," and the Corinthians, that the testimony of his conscience was the matter of his rejoicing; and as if to sum the whole in a nut-shell, he says to Timothy, "Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, a good conscience, and faith unfeigned."

We have been thus minute in order that you may have a very definite conception of what should be regarded the essential conditions of spiritual vitalization. It will hence not be necessary to protract this letter by entering into detail of all the conditions conducive to this end, as your

own reflections will discover them to you. You will, however, permit me to make a few suggestions on this interesting branch of our subject. From the foregoing, it is clear that if we wish to sustain our life which is "hid with Christ," and experience the highest enjoyment thereof, it is surely our privilege to do so. If there are any hindering causes, they are of our own creating. God's provisions are complete and the responsibility is justly ours in case we place outselves *without* their operations. Neither is it any the less ours, if we pervert these organs, and thus render nugatory all happifying effect, otherwise appointed to flow from them. No man can shut his eyes against the light of the sun and experience the pleasures of vision. So far as he is concerned, it is the same as if no light existed. He may again place himself in proper relation to that natural ordinance, and yet through disorder of the organ, be as effectually excluded from all enjoyment, as in the first case. Nay, experience teaches us that under such conditions, instead of pleasure, he does experience absolute pain. Equally true is it that we can at pleasure remove ourselves from under the vitalizing influences of the facts of the gospel, and, as a consequence, become "blind, not seeing afar off, and forgetting we were purged from our old sins." Or we can so stultify and debase our minds, hearts and consciences, as to debar ourselves from the enjoyments of a pure and holy life.

I have already made the remark, that were the analogies between things material or natural and spiritual not exact, it was specially excepted in the word of God. It may have already occurred to you that our present natural organization does suffer derangement and injury from causes independent of our control, and you ask, does the spiritual also? Most assuredly it does not. And here the word of God comes in to explain this departure from all correspondence with each other. One was "made subject to vanity," by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope, while the other is born of "incorruptible seed." The one is under a curse, the other under a blessing which exempts from all harm or danger. For sin, it is said, "shall not have dominion over you." "Being then made free from sin ye became the servants of righteousness." "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal bodies." The danger here is alone from within, and not without. For though trial and affliction may come,—"all things work together for good." Only as long as the branch is in the vine its life is secure, if Jesus be that vine. "Your life is hid with him," and your are "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.

I need not, after all I have said, declare to you that by submitting yourselves, your minds, your hearts and your consciences to the gos-

pel of his grace in all its facts, commands, and promises, you comply with the *canditions* of *invigorated spiritual vitalization*, and will reap enjoymets which the world cannot give or take away. And here I would close this letter, did it not seem as if I had ignored, in this presentation, the efficacy of of prayer in strengthening and invigorating spiritual life. Prayer is to the Christian what exercise is to the body. It is, in another respect the medium through which we see, feel, and hear in a spiritual sense, heavenly things, and the gracious channel through which every good and perfect gift comes down from above. Without it we could no more serve God acceptably, or grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord, than we could raise our own bodies from the earth by the direct exertion of that power resident in them. With it, we can, under the divine arrangement do all things, "through Him who strengtheneth us." For of him, and to him, and through him are all things, to whom be glory." A.

THE WANT OF PREACHERS.

Let me repeat to the mind of the reader two points we labored to enforce in the last number on this subject; first, God will not, by an extraordinary act of his power, beyond the ordinary means lodged in the gospel and in the church, call out men as he did Moses, prophets and apostles, to the work of the ministry. Were this so, the church might rest in unconcern and inactivity, leaving this matter alone to His hand, as beyond its authority and power. Second,—men cannot be taken at will, looking only to their natural, and even cultivated intellectual endowments, and sent forth as true heralds of the cross.—A higher preparation and a sublimer devotion is demanded. All the honorable pursuits of human life, with all their earthly advantages, are open to and followed by the general body of Christian men;—they labor in these pursuits six days in the week, prosper, and become rich, like other men, and like other men appropriate these results to their own earthly good chiefly. From all this the preacher of the gospel by his life-devotion, and life-work, is necessarily excluded. If the general body of Christians desire to know what extra amount of self-denial and consecration of heart this demands, let them simply put the test to themselves, and ask what degree of devotion to the gospel it would require in them, to free them altogether from every desire and every prospect of earthly advancement and gain; *to give this all up once and forever.* This is the true test; and this test the man that proposes to give his life to the ministry of the Cross must apply to himself. No man ever did, no man ever can, and we

hesitate not for a moment to say, no man ever ought to get gain by preaching the gospel. Men who have managed to accumulate wealth as preachers, have adopted a different philosophy from that which Christ and Paul knew; and God forbid that we should envy them. How then shall the lack of preachers be supplied? All we propose here is to offer some practical suggestions.

First, the church,—every congregation,—must have it constantly before it, as a high and holy duty, to cultivate and bring out of its midst every one whom the Word of God indicates as fitted for this work. This duty ought naturally to rest with great weight upon the hearts of the leaders of the church, the officers and men prominent for intelligence, experience and piety. Let these men diligently and earnestly seek out those who, as gracious gifts of God, might be so consecrated to this high and holy purpose. We must not, as a rule, wait for these men to develop themselves, and offer themselves to the church; such cases may and do always occur; but they are but exceptional ones, cases of very extraordinary endowments and impulses. We must seek for them diligently, as for anything precious; and when found, by all the means that the Holy Spirit places in our hands develop them for their glorious task. How many such valuable, true hearts have been lost to the evangelical work by the careless, cold indifference of the church; by never having been met by any tender, affectionate calling forth and cultivation from their nearest Christian brethren. 'Commit this to faithful men,' implies the seeking out and fitting of these men. Let us then, as congregations, look diligently for these gifts of piety, devotion and talents, and when found, joyfully cherish them as 'gifts' of God, and by every power given to us, develop them to the highest usefulness as missionaries of the Cross. We need not fear that we shall find more such than we need; the entire experience of the Christian church is testimony to the contrary. In the words of Jesus, however 'great the harvest, the laborers will always be *few*.' The more urgent need, therefore, to pray and seek for all that *may* be found.

We cannot, however, leave this point without uttering a much needed word of caution to the churches. It is no uncommon thing for the brethren, in the abundance of their kindness and esteem, when they have discovered a worthy young man of more than ordinary gifts of mind, to do him most serious injury by their imprudent and excessive expressions of appreciation of his worth and abilities, amounting to fulsome flattery. This is very dangerous to our poor human nature in its best estate, has ruined many altogether, and seriously damaged more, by sowing the seeds of an ungodly vanity and pride in the soul; by giving them false notions of themselves; by

drying up or polluting the pure stream of a holy, life-sacrificing, humble devotion to the Cross; and by giving them extravagant notions of a future of talents and success, that they can never realize.—How often has our heart been filled with sadness to see well-disposed Christian people, talking of and to a young preacher or candidate for the ministry, in a way we were confident would only be a sad stumbling-stone to his spiritual life and true usefulness. This insane worshipping of *talents* is a sad evil under the sun, working only mischief, and that continually. And this unfortunate tendency of our fallen, misguided nature, must do its evil work also in the church of God! We must be very wise and prudent, as well as affectionate and appreciative, toward these young men. Great evil is easily done, and with difficulty undone. Conceit implanted by the imprudent laudations of brethren, is, alas, not any too rarely found in young men who are preparing for, or are in, the ministry. And it is so very repulsive, so utterly opposed to the spirit of Jesus, that we ought earnestly to labor and pray for the minister of the Word to be saved from it. We remember a very striking case just now, illustrative of what we have said. Two young men, quite young, were by their own impulse of heart, and by the urgency of the brethren, brought to make their first effort in preaching. One was of ready gifts of mind and tongue; the other, of a deeper piety and a truer devotion, was behind his companion in public address. The brethren failing to appreciate the true merits of the two, surrounded the first with extravagant laudations, and gave him at once a call, and a position of confidence far beyond his years and real merits. The other met with much less encouragement than he needed and deserved. The head of the favored one was turned—his heart ruined. For the years he tried to preach it was always a sad effort at self-elevation; and now, in the best period of life, he is an utter moral wreck, and has been so for years. How much of this the imprudence of the brethren has to answer for, we presume not to say. The other, less appreciated, because he had the true impulse in his heart labored on and on, and is yet as he has been in the past, a true, worthy, and most useful minister of the Word.

But one of the most efficient instruments in filling up the ranks of the ministry, is the ministry itself. These are the men, who above every other class, if they are true men, must be presumed to feel most earnestly the want of men, well fitted, to enter into the great harvest field. These, too, rich in their own experience, and full of sympathies for this glorious work, are best qualified to discern and draw out those in the church whom God has designed for this mission.—The preacher, then, wherever he goes or abides, ought to have a con-

stant eye to this. He should call forth the desire of the evangelical life by constantly, earnestly, and fervently holding forth in the pulpit, in his prayers, and in his private conversation the necessity, duty, glory, and reward of the preacher's work. Let him constantly seek to woo and win men from the world's ambition, to the higher ambition of the Cross, 'of winning souls,' of shining as stars forever and ever. And what can be more delightful, what more spirit stirring, next to saving souls, than the gaining of true men to consecrate their whole lives as 'soldiers' of the cross?—to become messengers of the glad tidings of peace to the nations of the earth? And what an abundant storehouse of argument and motives, for inspiring such a life-sacrifice is furnished in the very arguments of the Gospel itself; in the illustrious host of examples of men of God from Paul to this day, who have lived and labored as true servants of the Cross; and in the joy here, and the starry crown hereafter that awaits them 'who turn many to righteousness?' 'He that winneth souls is wise;' let us never cease to hold up this transcendent wisdom before the eyes and hearts of the church.

Then another great duty still remains for the preachers whose character for intelligence, piety, and true motives, has been well established. It is their duty, and ought to be their great delight, to take such men as they have won for the ministry, under their especial charge. The veteran in the ministry is to instruct the young recruit in all the great matters that belong to the life he has before him. He is to inspire in him true *motives*; to labor earnestly that the young heart shall be freed from all false ideas, false purposes, and false ambitions, and be sanctified wholly to the exalted, sacred life before him. How very important this is, and what a glorious preparation this would be for the preacher's life, we need not stop to show. He is to be his guide and instructor in the gospel, leading him to a correct understanding of the Word of God, thus establishing him well in the faith, and saving him from many sad aberrations. He is to teach him *how* to preach. Many a one from the want of instruction on this point has carried unfortunate habits in his preaching, that have greatly weakened his power, to the end of his life. He is to impress upon his younger brother those important lessons of wisdom and prudence as to his public and private life, and of a noble and exalted integrity and nobility of soul, that will crown him with a lofty character, comprehending the great essential excellencies of an evangelical life, and that will sustain and save him amidst the labors, trials, and temptations that await him. In fine, drawing from the rich storehouse of the Divine Word, and the valuable treasure of his own experience, he can instruct and direct him by precept, example, and

training in all things how to fulfill his task, as a workman approved unto God.

One more suggestion we add here. Many cases most always occur where the young man devoting himself to the ministry, has not the opportunities for an academical education. In such cases, let him for as long a time as possible attach himself to some intelligent, educated, senior brother in the ministry, and let this one take a true interest in him, direct him and aid him in a proper course of studies. Sufficient time must be allowed for this; but it will not interfere with preaching twice or three times a week. This, of course can only be done with a preacher permanently located. In this way a young man may have his stated places and times of preaching, and can do much to support himself. This practice is very common in the old world, and is very advantageous and commendable. Even an educated young man would be profited by attaching himself in this way for some time to an elder brother in the ministry. This is done in other callings, and why not in this? Young men have much, very much, to learn, besides the elements of science, and this they can best learn from older and wiser heads, that have trodden for years the path they expect to tread. The relation between Paul and Timothy was a beautiful one; why is it not oftener repeated? why have we not more such Pauls and such Timothies?

Finally, the Christian *family* can do much to fill the ranks of the men of God. Here a great influence can be exercised in this direction. Instead of training the minds and hearts of the sons of the family only to become enterprising, skillful, prosperous business men, fitting them for accumulating earthly fortunes here, filling them with a mercantile, lucrative spirit,—let the pious father and mother hold up to their children the glories of a life wholly separated unto God, of a life that gives up for Jesus' sake, for the sake of winning souls, every hope and desire of earthly gain; let them by earnest, affectionate, and joyful lessons, drawn from the Divine Word and the experience of the glorious host of God's servants, and by their fervent prayers, lead the hearts of their sons to such an exalted sacrifice and consecration of themselves. How many a pious mother, how many a pious father, has thus brought his son as a precious offering unto God! Oh, it is sad to see, in this terribly commercial and lucrative age, Christian parents filling the hearts of their children with this insane passion for earthly property and gain, forgetful of the high and holy ambition of consecrating the minds and hearts of their sons to the ministry of the Cross! Christian fathers and mothers, set no example before your children that will lead them to love the world! load them not with the cares of worldly riches! How much happier you will be

at your parting from this life, when about to stand before the throne of the great Judge, to leave your son behind you as a devoted preacher of the Gospel, however poor, rather than burdened with and immersed in the cares of riches, and his heart ignorant of that wisdom that "winneth souls," and that would make him "shine as the stars forever!" C. L. L.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN CHURCHES.

Bro. J. W. McGarvey:—Your candid, clear, and courteous communication in the Millennial Harbinger for November, invites my attention. And though not included in your challenge, (invitation, perhaps, I should call it,) I offer a few notes upon it. I love volunteers in a good cause, and I may perhaps be admitted, like the amiable Queen Esther, into your presence: and I hope I may find favor in your eyes.

Your invitation is as follows: "The brethren who have adopted or advocated instrumental music in the church, owe it to themselves, * * * to meet the issue in candid, fraternal discussion." I wish to say, in advance, that I am no advocate of that practice. I would hold the issue *sub judice*, so far as this approach to you is concerned. Yet I am more than willing to see the subject carefully and even rigidly sifted. I only propose to awaken a query in regard to the soundness of your argument. It becomes us to defend the truth by truth. An unsound argument is not safe. If we build our cause on such our 'neighbor may come and search us out.' Then, not to defend the practice against which your essay is pointed, but to test the argument contained in it is the object of this note.

In your rejoinder to those who defend the practice in question from Jewish customs I see much to approve. The reason for the practice which you examine and set aside, I agree with you is a poor one.—It is to the second portion of the essay, containing the argument to which you "invite special attention" that I wish to advert. This is a positive, affirmative argument relied on to support the conclusion that the Holy Spirit *reprobates* the use of instruments of music in connexion with our worship. Your mode of argumentation is specious. Your frankness invites to the examination, or my diffidence in touching the work of a practiced pen would deter me from any attempt to disturb the repose in its conclusion to which you so easily conduct the acquiescing reader. But

1. A conclusion based on *silence*. This looks a little suspicious. In all courts of law, morals and science, we expect to find the verdict supported by affirmative proof. Since the day of lord Verulam, who de-

clared against reasoning by hypothesis, and laid the foundation of the correct mode of reasoning, 'it hath not been known that silence is a witness.' Poetry has license; and the poet of the "jocund year" has a line of fine feeling and admirable taste:—"Come, then, *expressive silence*, muse its praise." But we will not claim the poetic indulgence here. I am aware that the adventurous and vigorous Bishop of Gloucester founded an argument for the immortality of the soul, on the silence of Moses on the subject in the Pentateuch. But it is thought a bold experiment in reasoning on the part of the Bishop, and one of doubtful correctness.

Let us apply the argument to another subject to see whether it will stand. It is universally claimed by the Jews that Ezra collated the books of the Old Testament, and formed the sacred Canon;—that in this work he was assisted by the great council or Synagogue, of which two prophets at least, Haggai and Zechariah, were members. Yet *silence* pronounces all this untrue; for neither Haggai nor Zechariah, Ezra himself, nor Nehemiah, nor yet Malachi says a word about it. I am perfectly aware that this is a subject of some dispute. But such authors as Horne, Smith, (Jeremiah,) and Russell adopt without hesitation the conclusion that Ezra performed that service, in opposition to the argument from silence.

2. Is the reason assigned in the argument under consideration for the disuse of incense, lamps and priestly robes the correct reason? They are displaced truly; but why? The argument says "because the New Testament is silent about them." Now I have always been taught as one of the first principles of this "Refomation," that these, and other, and all parts of the Jewish economy passed into disuse because that institution "decayed, waxed old, and was ready to vanish away." This surely is the New Testament reason for the disuse, of the incense, lamplight and the robe, and not the fact that they are not mentioned in the New Testament. This sophistry is an example under the class, "*non causa pro causa*," or the assignation of a false reason.

3. You say, "seeing, then, that all the acts of Jewish worship had been appointed by divine authority, the only conceivable reason why any of them were discontinued must have been that they were unsuited to the Christian worship. The very fact, therefore, that any part of the Jewish worship was discontinued by those who organized the Christian church, is a direct condemnation of it by the Spirit of God, as unsuited to the new institution. But the use of instrumental music is an element of Jewish worship which was thus discontinued, and therefore it is condemned by the infallible authority of the Spirit."

Now this argument, which is cetainly very intelligible, runs thus:

1. Practices ordained in the law of Moses, on which the New Testament is silent, are condemned by the Holy Spirit:

2. But the robe, the oil and the incense, and instrumental music are thus ordained, and not mentiond in the New Testament:

3. Therefore the robe, the oil, the incense and instrumental music are condemned by the Holy Spirit.

But alas! for the conclusion,—instrumental music is not of that category! Where is the record that it was ordained in the law?—Moses is "silent" about it. I know it was in use before the law, (see Ex. 15.) doubtless long before. But that it was incorporated into the ancient institution, so as to bring it under the class of reasoning here discussed appears insupportable; and to bring upon it, *for that reason*, the reprobatory condemnation of the silence of the New Testament is inadmissible. A. S. Hayden.

Collamer, O., Dec. 2nd. 1861.

Remarks.—Bro. Hayden writes, as he always does, like a courteous Christian gentleman. He is not in favor organs in churches, but he is also opposed to resting the conclusion on the subject, upon a basis of false logic. Understand, reader, he attacks brother McGarvey's logic,—and yet agrees with him in his opposition to instrumental music in our church worship. We shall leave brother McGarvey to defend himself. Bro. Hayden handles a keen dissecting knife. We know too, brother McGarvey understauds well the use of the weapons of logic, and if he shall find, that he has not yet taken the wind out of the organs, I know he will be at them again, like a true knight, and deal them yet mightier blows to their overthrow.

We notice a growing heat under the discussion of this subject—but let us keep cool; we will commit less sin against logic and music both, and be much surer of victory. A man can make heresy out of any subject, and almost any side of it, by a sinful violence in his advocacy of it. I do not think the organ is likely to be a syren of much mischief among us, at present. I hope our churches have a better present use for their surplus cash, than to spend it upon such "wind of doctrine," as an organ. Let us spend more time in training our own throats and in cultivating the musical powers which God has given us in the voices of our children, and we will have less need for the mechanical aids of organ pipes.

The controversy, at present, ought to be against "melodians," as it is this *cheap* form of musical instruments, that for the most part satisfies the present *instrumental* extravagance of our musical *amateurs*.—It is a *smaller* sin, measured in cubical feet, and not so noisy,—but then if there be merit in a musical instrument, as a means of praise,

let us give the Lord the best. It is a shame to make his entertainments so cheap and feeble, as they must be from the little foot-bellows of a "melodian." Think of relegating the high sounding praise of the Most High to the unwashed foot of some peddle-worker, employed at a cheap rate to inflate the bellows and open the pipes, *secundem artem*, with no *soul* at all in the matter, except it be indeed the *sole* of his boot!

It is the encense of the heart that rises gratefully to the throne of favor, and let us offer this. The feeblest and most untrained voice can unite in this, when it is rising up upon a thousand jubilant voices, —but not so, when the music is given over to the scientific caprice of a hired and professional organist. Intent upon sweeping grandly through the chords of some difficult composition, he is gratified to find himself beyond the region of the vulgar crowd and to see them silent, if not in praise, at least in astonishment at the wonders of his skill. This is the *practical* effect nine times in ten—and this is the true evil of musical instruments in church worship. We shall have more on this subject again, but let it be in the sweet spirit of harmony.

W. K. P.

"THE WALTER SCOTT MONUMENT."

The movement proposed, we understand, at the last Missionary meeting, to raise a fund for erecting a monument to our beloved Bro. Walter Scott, will, we trust, be abandoned. All admirers of great and good men will doubtless agree that there should be a durable stone raised over the place where lie the remains of this great pleader of the cause of Christ. A simple stone, not for vain display or monumental pomp, but *in memoriam*, that the servants of the Lord, in passing by, may pause to meditate, and gather the true lesson of every great life—that its glory consists in having rendered active and earnest service for humanity and God. But such a stone has, doubtless, already been planted over the grave of this once eloquent preacher of the truth. Let this suffice, so far as the sculptor's art is concerned.

We have no objection to expressing our admiration for the great and good men that have deserved, by their work, the gratitude of mankind. Let them stand with their appropriate honors in the mighty cloud of witnesses that behold us, who are yet toiling in the dust of the arena; but do not bind them down with sculptured urns in earthly tombs. Let us think of them as above. The tomb of Joseph was opened and abandoned—and we have always regarded the zeal for its discovery as springing from a low conception of the true glory of our risen Lord.

Would the brethren honor the life of Walter Scott, as he would like to see it honored? Let them raise a fund for educating preachers of the gospel, and endow a "Walter Scott Chair" in some of our colleges—and thus honor the man, by perpetuating under his name the great work of his life. This would be at the same time a wise and benevolent use of the money, and an appropriate memento to this pioneer hero of the Cross. This can easily be done, and then through long, long years to come, when panegyrics shall have faded from the graven tablet of stone, will the name and the praise of Walter Scott run through the hearts of the living generations of men, as one whose memory is perpetuated by the reproduction of his life in mutlitudes of successors in the proclamation of the everlasting gospel, of which he was a successful and distinguished preacher.

It is known to our readers that Bro. Scott left the most valuable books of his library to Bethany College. He communicated his intention to do so to me, on occasion of one of his visits to Bethany, and I remarked casually, that we might make it the nucleus of "The Walter Scott Library." We well remember the expression of his noble and genius-lit face, as he replied—"I desire no greater honor when I am gone, than to be associated with Bro. Campbell and Bethany College in the heart and memory of my brethren." This is the true feeling of a genuine man. Your sham and surface man desires the glory of a marble monument;—he wants a graceful shaft, full of fulsome praise—and if no body else will raise it, he will curtail the legacies of his greedy heirs, to provide for it himself. But the true man desires to live in his work, and by his work and with his work, not only through all his mortal days, but through whatever of immortality he may win in the memory of his kind. Such, we think, was Walter Scott, and thus let him be honored by those who are ready to give of their abundance to raise a monument worthy of his name.—Who will give for the endowment of "the Walter Scott Chair"?

W. K. P.

Dr. Heidenheim, a learned critic in the ancient manuscrip's of the Bible, has lately been in Rome, and devoted especial attention to the *Codex Hierosolymitanus*, in the Vatican Library. This codex is especially important, as it is written in the Aramaic dialect, the language spoken in the days of Jesus. Dr. Heidenheim is thoroughly familiar with the Semitic dialect, which well fits him for editing this manuscript, which he is about to do, without delay, at Leipsic. This codex was copied in the tenth century from an earlier manuscript and contains the Gospels of Matthew, Luke and John, and a part of Mark.

SUMMARY OF DONATIONS TO AMERICAN COLLEGES.

The following summary of liberalities to American colleges for the last two years, a period of a terible war, we copy from a New York secular paper. If minor contributions were added, no doubt the total would be still largely increased:

Middlebury College,	of Vermont,	has received	$ 10 000
Williams "	of Massachusetts,	has received	25 000
Harvard "	"	"	44 000
Dartmouth "	of New Hampshire,	"	47 000
Andover Theological Seminary		"	50 000
Washington University, St. Louis,		"	50 000
New York "	New York,	"	60 000
Bowdoin College, Maine,		"	72 000
Chicago Theological Seminary, Illinois,		"	80 000
Hamilton College, New York,		"	10 000
Rutgers "	New Jersey,	"	100 000
Trinity "	Hartford, Ct.,	"	100 000
Protestant "	Syria,	"	103 000
Amherst "	Massachusetts,	"	110 000
Princeton "	New Jersey,	"	130 000
Yale, "	New Haven, Ct.,	"	450 000
		Total	1 531 000

ART THOU A CHRISTIAN?

Art thou a Christian? Though thy cot
Be small, and poverty thy lot,
Rejoice! Thy Savior learned to know
The ills of want, the cares of woe;
And to the faithful poor has given
The rich inheritance of heaven.

Art thou a Christian, doomed to roam
Far from thy friends and native home?
Look round on valleys, hills and plains,
Cliffs crowned with rocks, and fields with grain;
View nature's charms and busy man;
Then tell me, midst the varied plan,
What have you marked, or what surveyed,
That God, your Father, has not made?

Then view his works, and learn to trace
His semblance in a stranger's face;
Call each sweet spot a home to thee,
And every man God's family.
Art thou a Christian? 'Mid the strife
Of years mature and busy life,
Be fruitful, for thy race is short;
Thy bark is hastening into port:
Be cheerful, holy angels bear
An antidote for all thy care:
And let not pangs disturb a breast
Prepared for everlasting rest.

GOOD WORDS FROM OUR CORRESPONDENTS.

Bowling Green, Ky., Dec. 4th, 1864.

Bro. Pendleton:—According to promise, I will give you a short sketch of my labors, evangelizing in Western Kentucky for six or seven months. But few, who have not experienced it, are aware of the many difficulties and embarrassments under which we labor in preaching the gospel in its original purity and simplicity in this section. The horrid civil war that is now sweeping our once tranquil and happy land, is leaving its mark of desolation and devastation wherever it has gone, and more especially where I have been laboring. A large majority of the churches I have visited, I have found in a divided and distracted condition, and many have not had a sermon for two, and some for more than three, years. I have however organized, re-organized, revived, and "set all things in order," where I have gone. But there is too much of this kind of work for a few. We need more help—men who will attend to these bad cases, and not avoid them because they can find other places to engage their attention. Where are the hosts of talented young men with whom we were once happily associated at Kentucky University, Gravespring Academy, and Bethany College? Do I hear their voices amid the tumult of the world and the convulsions of a nation, pleading the cause of Jesus? Do I see them proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation, the joyful news of redemption to a dying and a sinful world? It would make my soul rejoice. Some of them, I am informed, are in the cold and silent grave, to which we are all hastening. Others are in the counting-room and the law office. Brethren, will you not lay aside these fruitless things, and advocate a better cause? They are all transitory and unsatisfying at best. It is a knowledge of Jesus and his commandments alone that can carry us through the dark and gloomy valley and shadow of death, and give us a crown of immortality and a wreath of celestial glory in the bright realms above. There was a time when I had but little thought of engaging in this, the best of all occupations. But thanks be to the Lord for the change that suddenly came over my mind. It was a change from evil to good, from darkness to light.

On the 18th of March, 1864, a very cold and disagreeable day, I started out to engage in the good work of evangelizing, for which I had been preparing for some time, but had engaged in it but little. The present was dark, the future was gloomy, and so far as the things of this vain world are concerned, it was like launching out amid the storms and billows of a tempestuous sea, where all was uncertain and dangerous. Since that time I have been engaged, whenever I could, for over six months, preaching the gospel to the dying sons and daughters of anguish, and doing all I could to check the tide of sin and stem the torrent of corruption that is now sweeping over a once favored land. I have held several meetings with different brethren, but have been alone most of the time. Result—129 additions, and several restored to their first love; one church organized, two re-organized and two revived; contributions received for the Ky. Missionary Society, $211.45; and about $200 for local preachers. During the last month I have organized one church six miles east of Bowling Green, in an intelligent community, and had 15 additions—4 from the Baptists.

We who preach the gospel reap not our reward in this world, but beyond the ocean of death. There we shall dwell with Jesus and join the seraphic host, the redeemed of every land, kindred, tribe and tongue, in singing God's praise in one eternal day. Fraternally, M. P. Baily.

Philadelphia, 1864.

Dear Bro. Pendleton:—Your very welcome and highly appreciated favor came duly to hand. I thank you for your kind suggestions and words of encouragement.

The want of a suitable brother for this field of labor, seems, under the hand of Providence, to be singularly supplied in Bro. Geo. Mullins, of Kentucky, who assumes the charge at the unanimous voice of the brethren. Since my connection with the congregation, I have never witnessed so much unity, zeal and earnestness. The brethren trusting in the promises of our Heavenly Father, while pleading and working, anticipate the richest blessings.

I trust our late troubles will only tend to knit us more closely together in the unity of spirit and bonds of peace, and to the furtherance of the gospel among us. The health of our dear Bro. Rowsee is not so good as formerly. He is as a ripe sheaf ready for the harvest. Your Bro., S. W. Van Culin.

☞ We sincerely rejoice with our brethren of Philadelphia in their good fortune in securing the services of our excellent Bro. Mullins. This congregation has some of the noblest of the Lord's people in her folds, and we trust, is destined soon to rise above all her entanglements, and shine anew in the beauty of holiness. Bro. Rowsee has long been one of the brethren known and read of all men. For integrity, piety, zeal, and industry in behalf of the cause in Philadelphia, he is above praise. We sincerely regret to know that his health is declining. May the Lord preserve him for still longer and greater service in his kingdom on earth, and bring him to stil higher fitness for the honors and joys of his kingdom in the heavens. We say, "the tide of empire westward rolls," but the tide of the gospel, much like that of the ocean, sweeps over all lands, and brings glad tidings to all peoples. Within a few years past, many valuable men have turned their faces eastward, and are bearing back the truth to the wellsprings of error. Bro. Franklin, in a recent notice of this movement, mentions Bro. J. A. Headington, of Ill., gone to Danbury, Conn., Bro. Mullins, of Ky., to Phila., Pa., Bro. W. Patterson, to St. Johns, New Brunswick, Bro. Brewer, to New York City, Bro. Belding, to Syracuse, Central New York, and Bro. D. S. Burnet, to Baltimore, Md. All these brethren are beginning to see of the fruit of their labor to the satisfaction of their souls, and are calling for help. We rejoice in this sign, and heartily respond to the exhortation of our gifted and successful Bro. Belding, which we give below.—W. K. P.

Syracuse, N. Y., Dec., 1864.

Bro. Pendleton:—We are just closing up the second year of labor in this city, which ends with the middle of February, during which time a church has been organized, and increased to the number of one hundred and twenty-three, a beautiful church edifice erected, at a cost of over nine thousand dollars, (over six thousand of which has been paid,) neatly furnished—together with a Bible class and Sunday School, all in a prosperous condition. Bro. A. N. Gilbert

has been spending a few days with us in preaching the "unsearchable riches of Christ," which resulted in seventeen additions to the church. Would that the brethren could be induced to turn their attention to this eastern field of labor, which promises an abundant harvest for the means expended.

Yours in hope, W. A. Belding.

Muir, Mich., Jan. 4, 1865.

The labors of the last two years of my life have been diverted from my home field, for the sake of establishing the cause on a more prosperous footing in the chief city of our State. The church in Jefferson Avenue, which was organized two years ago, with 17 members, now numbers about 120. Most of these had not previously known of our people or our principles. The church is steadily growing in public confidence, and gradually extending her sphere of usefulness. Bro. W. T. Moore has entered on the pastoral care of the congregation; and from all that we know of his ability and faithfulness, and of the zeal and devotion of the membership, we are confident of continued and increasing prosperity for the cause in Detroit. It has been hard to break away from the pleasant associations and affectionate co-operation of as pleasant and devoted a band of Christians as I have ever known. But duty calls me back to my former home, and I am glad to leave a church, so tenderly loved, in faithful hands.

Bro. W. B. Hendryx is holding a meeting at Berlin, in this county, at which some twenty souls have already turned to the Lord. I. E.

Dear Bro. Pendleton:—I have been laboring for the brethren at Barnesville, Ohio, a part of my time, for near two years past. Our Methodist brethren had for many years the entire religious control of that community, and under their peculiar manner of conducting protracted meetings, with the usual excitement and disorder attending such scenes, the young people had grown up, and seldom, if ever, did I labor in a community where the mass of this class were so disorderly at church; but since our labors there some years since in company with Bro. W. T. Moore and others, and the constant effort of our brethren there for good order, things have very much changed for the better. We now have a very respectable congregation of Disciples there, a pretty good house with a baptistry, and a fine hearing of orderly people from the world.—Recently we protracted a meeting there for a number of days, in company with our esteemed young Bro. Pinkerton, now of Bethany College, which resulted in thirty-three additions to the church, and a fine influence in the community. I trust that these young disciples will ever listen to the Savior, and walk in his ways. A. E. M.

Dear Bro. Loos:—As an item of church news, please say, in the next issue of the Harbinger, that since you were with us at our annual meeting in August last, we have had 20 accessions to the church—one restored, 8 by letter, and 13 by confession and baptism.

I may also say, that during the last nine months we have had 52 additions. We have now a membesrhip of 300. Our greatest increase, however, during the past year, has been *from within*—in the improved tone and spiritual power of the church.

The lot for our new house of worship is, as you know, purchased and paid

for. The plan of the house has been adopted, and the Trustees are preparing to commence the work as soon as the spring opens. Yours truly,

ALLEGHENY CITY, PA. JOSEPH KING.

BRO. PENDLETON:—The cause of our blessed Master is gaining ground rapidly in Indiana. Bro. A. J. Hobbs has had a most successful meeting at Wabash; 10 have been immersed. Bro. R. Edmundson has labored several weeks in 10th district; result, 22 added—18 by baptism. Bro. Lockhart reports good meetings in 5th district, resulting in 5 additions. Bro. A. Ward reports from Sullivan county, 67 additions—43 by baptism. The Lord is abundantly blessing the labors of his faithful "missionaries." In faith and hope,

Indianapolis, Ind. R. L. HOWE, Cor. Sec. I. C. M. S.

MARTINSBURG, Knox co., O., Jan. 4, 1865.

BRO. PENDLETON.—As an item of religious news, I would say that Brother Moody and myself have just closed up a very interesting meeting with our old congregation, the result of which was 50 additions, as follows:—39 were immersed, 5 by commendation, 2 from the United Brethren, 2 from the "Christians," and 2 restored. People came from a distance of 8 miles and were immersed. It was a glorious meeting—it continued 16 days.

Yours in Gospel bonds, D. G. MITCHELL.

BRO. PENBLETON:—Brother W. T. Coun and I labored in the Anderson Co operation for the year ending 2nd Lord's day in October last. Bro. Coun reports 75—I 144—as the result of our labors in proselyting. I delivered 433 regular discourses, rode upwards of 3,000 miles, and visted 500 families. The number of families visited and miles ridden by Bro. Coun, I do not now recollect. Yours in hope of life eternal, L. MARROTT.

ROCK TOWER, Tenn., Dec. 20, 1864.

BRO. PENDLETON:—I have recently returned from a trip up our river into Kentucky. We had attentive congregations, and immersed three noble persons. We visited three congregations, but none of them meet weekly. Bro. Drury Lollar vists them once in each month alternately. We love him, but if they would meet every Lord's day and worship, we think his labors would be more fruitful. A. SALLEE.

BRO. PENDLETON:—I report 9 additions to the church of Christ as the first fruits of my labor in the Lord. This outside of any regular organization of our brethren, and on territory heretofore occupied by the Methodists. Also, two more reclaimed. Nearly all of these have united with the Captina congregation in this county. Yours in Christ,

Armstrong Mills, O., Jan. 9, '65. ISAAC IIAMS.

Bro. David Walk, now pastor of the church of Christ at Paris, Ky., has recently held meetings with the following results: Clintonville, Ky., 26 confessions; Millersburg, Ky., 29 confessions; Tuscola, Ill., 16 confessions.

Bro. J. F. Brown is engaged to preach for the church at Paducah, Ky., for the year 1865.

OBITUARIES.

Died, in Trenton, Mo., Nov. 9th, 1864, Mrs. Drusilla W., wife of Elder B. H. Smith, of St. Louis, aged 36 years and 23 days.

She died of Consumption, but throughout a protracted illness of unusual suffering, she bore her affliction with unshaken Christian fortitude and patience. Faith triumphed signally over sense, and the sustaining power of Christ has seldom been more signally displayed, than in her triumphant struggle with the pangs of the last hour. Her mind and her confidence were both clear and strong to the last. The Lord's day evening before she died, she bade farewell to her husband, children, relatives and friends—spoke of her departure, as going home—exhorted them to love the Savior, and comforted them with the hope of a speedy re-union, where parting should be no more.

Sister Smith was the companion of her husband while he was a student of Bethany College, and we knew her well. Her devotion, fidelity, fortitude, and deep, affectionate interest in the success of her husband in his noble efforts to fit himself for the high spheres of usefulness which opened up before him in the church, all combined to impress us with the truly heroic Christian heart of this beloved sister. We can appreciate the loss of our bereaved brother, and that of his four children, whom she leaves to his care, and while we read his letter of tender eloquence, telling us his loss, realize how deep is the anguish that such a stroke has laid upon his house. May the God of all consolation give him comfort, and raise his heart up out of this deep of sorrow to higher visions of the glory to which he is called in the service of the gospel.

W. K. P.

Died, at her mother's, in Bethany, W. V., Miss Lavinia A. Llewellin, aged 29 years. The life of this gentle and lovely sister has been spent in our midst, and her quiet and unobtrusive virtues are known to us all. She was of a gentle and meek disposition—fond of nature and of letters—and looked upon all things true, beautiful and good, with the loving eye of a deeply emotional and poetic nature. Her piety was deep and heartfelt, and showed itself as well at home, in honoring her widowed mother, as in the house of the Lord, in the worship of the Most High.

She Died of Diphtheria, and suffered much, but in harmony with the characteristic meekness of her life, she bore her affliction with a quiet patience, that excited the tenderest sympathy. Like a tender flower she withered, died, and we laid her away: but the fragrance of her memory shall remain with us for many days to come, and remind us how sweet is the charm of a life spent in loving all things that God has made beautiful and good, and strong to do all things which he has commanded.

W. K. P.

Died, of Diphtheria, Mary Ann, our only daughter, aged 15 months and 11 days, She suffered eleven days, and on the 15th of August, '64, her spirit left this world of sin and sorrow. We sorrow not as those who have no hope: for according to the words of our dear Savior, we shall surely see her; for "in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." Her death has made us sad; but we know our loss is her gain; she has only gone before us.

J. Franklin.

Fort Desmoines, Iowa, Nov, 14, 1864.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 36.] BETHANY, W. V., *FEBRUARY*, 1865. [No. II.

LINSEY-WOOLSEY.

Thou shalt not wear a garment of divers sorts, as of linen and woolen together.—DEUT. 22. 11.

It is impossible to read the instructions given in the New Testament to Preachers and Teachers, and not be impressed with the idea of *self-consecration to spiritual duties*, as belonging to the Christian minister. To Timothy, it is said: "Give attention to reading, to exhortation, to teaching."* "Be an example to the believers in word, in behavior, in love, in spirit, in faithfulness, in purity."† "Meditate upon these things; give yourself wholly to them, that your advancement may be manifest in all things."‡ "Do you therefore suffer evil as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. Every one that serves as a soldier, keeps himself free from the business of this life, that he may please him that has chosen him to be a soldier."‖ On the elders of the church at Ephesus, it is enjoined, "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, that you be shepherds to the church of God, which he has purchased with his own blood."§ The example is placed before them of one, who had not ceased, by day and by night, to warn the people with tears."¶ They are to "watch for souls"**—to be "examples to the flock"—and as under-shepherds, to cherish the spirit and imitate the life of the Chief Shepherd and Bishop of souls.††

* 1 Tim. iv. 13, Anderson's Trans. † Idem ver. 12. ‡ Id. ver. 15.
‖ 2 Tim. ii. 3, 4. § Acts xx. 28. ¶ Id. ver. 31.
** Heb. xiii. 17. †† 1st Peter v. 1–4.

True, there is no such divorcement of religious from secular affairs as to make it inconsistent with the *holiness* of the minister's calling to attend to any lawful business. The true view of religion sanctifies every legitimate calling, and incorporates the integrity and purity of the kingdom of heaven with the commerce of life—with our daily vocations, toils, sorrows, recreations; with domestic and social relationships; with the rights of citizenship, and with official trusts: so that whether we eat or drink, or whatever we do, we are to do all to the glory of God. The self-banishment of monks and nuns from the sweet sanctities of domestic relationships, and the active duties and conflicts of our daily life, together with the psychological principles that underlie the doctrines of mysticism, involve a monstrous lie against the nature God has given us, and lead to a cowardly abandonment of a necessary warfare. At best, they furnish but a partial development of our being, amounting to deformity. Their dwarfing of some powers, the exorbitant culture of others, ends in a solemn caricature of a nature whose beauty is found only in its symmetry, and whose brightest crown is won in hand-to-hand contests with the temptations and seductions of every day life. Hence, so far from divorcing the ministry from secular pursuits, on the score of their incompatibility with the holiness of a saint, Paul held up before the Ephesian elders, apostolic hands, that were not less holy when plying the instruments of the tent-maker, than when laid upon the head of Timothy, to communicate spiritual gifts; and taught them that after his example, they should labor at honest callings, for the support of the needy.

This, however, does not touch the general question of expediency and propriety, on the part of a Christian minister, in holding himself aloof from all worldly pursuits, that he may give himself exclusively, in the undivided strength and sympathy of his being, to the noblest of callings. While, for special reasons, Paul occasionally subsided into the level of worldly business, it was only occasionally. And the speciality of the plea by which he justifies these exceptional divergences from the path of ministerial toil, is itself the clearest proof that, ordinarily, such departures are not to be desired or justified.—There stands the solemn injunction: "Give thyself *wholly* to these things."

With these premises before us, it becomes a grave question—and, at this time, a question fraught with practical value—Whether Christian ministers can, without sacrificing the integrity of their vocation, participate in the strifes of political parties? Can they consistently appear, on the Lord's day, in the pulpit, to preach Christ crucified,

*1st Cor. x. 31.

and on Monday, at the hustings, to plead for a favorite political candidate? Can they give themselves wholly to the duties of their ministry, and at the same time enter into all the fierce excitements of party contests, either to secure their own election to office, or to promote the interests of political creeds and parties?

During the intensely exciting campaign of the autumn of 1864, as well as in some previous contests, a considerable number of preachers were prominent as stump-speakers. We have heard of several of our own evangelists—brethren of high standing and of marked ability—who have become somewhat distinguished as stump-orators and political exhorters; sometimes sustaining a creditable reputation on the political stage, as leading characters in the main performance, and sometimes bringing down the house with the comicalities of the after-piece! We do not write this to cast censure on the past. We are aware that we live in peculiar times, when the magnitude of the interests involved in our political controversies, and the bearing of public questions on the interests of humanity, stir the hearts of good men with unusual desire, and tempt them out of the beaten paths of life, to walk in untried ways, and to act strange parts. We question not the motives of these highly esteemed brethren. Did we not know them and love them half as well as we do, we still know too well, in our own heart, the awfulness and the agony of these times, not to understand that a high sense of duty may have prompted a course which, without a special plea, they could never justify to themselves. But we take the occasion, now that the excitement is past, for a calm discussion of this question, for the sake of its future bearings. The examples to which we have alluded, carry great power with them. If they are evil, they will prove a fountain of mischief, if they are not stopped. Their effect on the character of our rising ministry will be very decided. We think we can see disastrous results to the ministry and to the churches, in this exchange of the "clean white linen" that has clothed the "man of God," for the coarse linsey-woolsey garb of the mongrel political priest, or priestly politician. We therefore call it up for investigation; for we are sure that our beloved brethren in the ministry, who have, in the ardor of a powerful excitement, lent themselves to political contests, would be the last to justify it, if they saw evil and mischief thence resulting to the churches of the saints.

We ask, then: Ought a Christian minister to be a politician—a stump orator—an advocate of party politics—a candidate for political honors? And we answer, emphatically, *No.*

To guard against all needless issues, let us state here what admissions we are prepared to make to those who hold an opposite view of this question,

1. We have no sympathy with that view of the Christian ministry, which degrades its members into mental imbecility touching all matters outside the limits of their professional duties. We have long since lost patience with the patronizing style indulged in towards preachers as a class, as if their profession necessarily reduced them to the grade of simpletons in all political matters. We enter no plea of mental incapacity. The intellectual standard of a successful politician, is not necessarily an elevated one. The combination of faculties requisite for a political demagogue or successful partizan, is not one that a preacher of respectable attainments need to envy. The nimble wit, the small cunning, the spread-eagle rhetoric, the hypocritical complaisance, the clownish drollery, the cool assumption, the impudent dogmatism, the elasticity of conscience, and the Janus-faced duplicity, which constitute the staple of prosperous political commerce, could scarcely be accepted as valuable additions to the intellectual and moral endowments of a minister of the gospel. While we recognize many honorable individual exceptions, we are free to say that politicians, as a class, abound much more largely in the qualities which we have enumerated, than in sober judgment, honest logic, high integrity, manly independence, or honorable devotion to the interests of justice and humanity.

2. We do not argue for an entire separation of religion and politics. We believe there are political duties to be performed, in which, as in all else, the Christian may religiously act his part. We have no idea that that can be right for a man as a politician, which would be wrong for him as a Christian. The principles of right are eternal, immutable, universal, in spite of all sophistries. Christianity is not dignified by its separation from any of the duties of life—but by the power it bestows for their faithful performance. It is the leaven of truth and love, which, deposited in our nature, ceases not its office till the whole mass is leavened. Duty is always holy. We are willing to admit, moreover, that under a government like our own—the offspring of a public sentiment which the doctrine of Christ had donemuch to recover from the despotic and inhuman spirit and tendencies of former ages, the Christian may rightfully cherish an interest which the early Christians could not know in behalf of the cruel and irresponsible despotism under which they suffered. Every step of progress towards the universal reign of righteousness and peace, must quicken the pulsations of a Christian heart.

3. We are far from saying that a Christian or a Christian minister should never hold office. We recognize the necessity for enlightened Christian statesmanship, which, rising grandly above the selfishness and bitterness of political partnership, shall be heard in a calm voice

of truth and benevolence, speaking to the winds and waves of our angry political seas; and be hailed, like the star of Bethlehem, as a divinely-kindled light, to guide night-circled wanderers to the oracle of wisdom and salvation. The spirit of our laws and the genius of our institutions need a richer inspiration of the lofty justice, the human sympathy, the love that would elevate and not degrade, bless and not curse, save and not destroy, which Christianity inculcates; and a fuller acceptance of the sacredness and dignity of human nature—that nature which God has wedded to his own, and which the mission of Jesus has made forever illustrious by conferring on it the fatherhood of God and the heirship of immortality. But so far as ministers of the gospel are concerned, while we readily accord to them sufficient ability for *politicians*, the cases must be very rare in which their training and culture would not debar them from the responsibilities of *statesmanship*. The Bible does indeed furnish a few names like that of Daniel, that shine with equal luster as prophets and as statesmen. Profane history also furnishes now and then a name which wears without dishonor the intertwined emblems of theological and political supremacy. But these were under politico-ecclesiastical governments, where the educated classes were trained to respect the blended interests of church and State, and to unite the studies that related to civil and ecclesiastical affairs. And even here our memory does not at present furnish a name which we can present as an example, where ecclesiastical robes were not somewhat stained with the defilements of the court, or where the comprehensiveness and justice of a wise statesmanship was not marred by the narrowness or intolerance of theological prejudice. At all events, if God has such a work for any of his servants, he will confer it on them. They need not seek it.—Even when offered to them, they would be the better for the shrinking timidity of Moses, and would do well to ask, like Gideon, for a double sign, ere they enter on their untried task.

But we are seeking the rule now—not the exceptions. It is illogical to reason from a special case to a general conclusion—from particulars to universals. We affirm our deep conviction that, as a general rule, preachers should carefully abstain from all participation in political strifes, and religiously refuse to be ranked with the advocates of party politics. For this we have many reasons, some of which we proceed to lay before our readers.

1. The duties of the ministry are too imperative to allow of any great diversion of time, sympathy and effort, from the one supreme object.

These duties must ever rise, in grandeur and importance, above the claims of every earthly enterprise. To save souls from ruin—to lead

the candidates for immortality along the rugged steeps of Christian life—to recover captive souls out of the snares of Satan—these are every-day duties, whose claims should not be surrendered lightly. The gain of a thousand converts to a political party would be no compensation for the loss of a soul. Well did the eloquent William Archer Butler say, in an address to the College Historical Society of Dublin: "There is yet a higher office than either the pleader's or senator's—an office in which eloquence finds at once its loftiest theme, its purest inspiration, and its most most momentous purpose. The statesman deals with the concerns of empires; but empires, though they flourish through a life of centuries, yet ultimately share in the mortality of their founders. The advocate vindicates the claims of individuals whose earthly existence is still more transient; but to the preacher alone is appropriated the assertion of a subject whose extent is infinite, whose duration is eternal. To him alone is it given to consider man in the one aspect in which he is unchangeably sublime — With every other view of his nature, the low and the ludicrous may mingle; for in every other view he is a compound of the wondrous and the worthless; but in the contemplation of a being whose birth is the first hour of an unending existence, no artifice can equal that impression of awful admiration which is the great element of sublimity—a feeling which overclouds all the brilliant rivalry of wit, and overwhelms all the efforts of opposing arguments." It is impossible to take this view of the preacher's office, and yet feel that we have time to spare from these lofty functions and fearful responsibilities, for the swagger and uproar, the jest and jeer, the coarse jollity, the low comicalities, the cunning sophistries, or the tumid declamations of the political platform. Scarcely for the sober justice, calm dignity, and conscientious laboriousness of the most honorable statesmanship, could the successful preacher feel at liberty to lay aside his celestial panoply, lock up the magazines of his spiritual power, and descend from his sublime position to wield a merely human power, and work for merely human ends. For political uses, enough ready instruments may always be found; but in these great fields of spiritual enterprise, "the harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few."

2. The one great end for which the preacher labors, must be largely defeated if he mingles in political strife.

It is never wise to erect inferior interests in the way of a greater good. The great apostle to the Gentiles—the noblest model of the Christian preacher—has given us a lesson of sound wisdom on this point. "For though I am free from all men, yet have I made myself a servant to all, that I may gain the more. And to the Jews, I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to those who are under law, as

under law (not being myself under law), that I might gain those under law; to those who are without law, as without law, (not being myself without law to God, but under law to Christ,) that I might gain those who are without law: to the weak I became like one who was weak, that I might gain the weak: I have become all things to all men, that I may, by all means, save some. *And this I do for the gospel's sake*, that I may share its benefits with you."* This is true wisdom. The particular prejudices of Jew or Greek, were as nothing in comparison with the interests of eternal life. Paul could well afford to suppress his own judgment, and humor the prejudices of Jew or Gentile, if, by this prudence, he could propitiate a hearing for the message of mercy and save a soul from death. For a similar reason, the preacher should guard against exciting prejudice on inferior issues, and keep an open path to the hearts of men for the truth of God.—The membership of our churches will always embrace a variety of political sentiment. To attempt to force unity of political opinion or action, as a test of membership, would be a monstrous usurpation, and an enormous wickedness. Yet, practically, it must come to this, if preachers turn politicians. The men whom they assail on the stump, will not hear them in the pulpit. Schism and all its bitter fruits will curse the church. The lines of political parties will be also the limits of religious fellowship. Democratic sinners will not listen to Republican preachers, nor will Republican sinners accept the gospel from Democratic lips. Nay, even those with whom the preacher may have acted in political concert, will fail to respect him in his religious capacity. Politicians are perfectly willing to use preachers to further their own ends. But when the end is gained, the instrument is despised.

3. Political crowds will draw the preacher to their level;—he can not lift them up to his.

Christian politicians may sometimes preach with propriety,—for that is an *upward* movement, which honors Christ before the world. But Christian preachers may not be politicians, for that is a *downward* movement, which dishonors Christ in the sight of men. It is simply impossible for most preachers to enter the arena of political strife without a loss of dignity—I had almost said of integrity. They must descend to the taste of their hearers, and cater to foolish and vicious propensities. They must wink at intrigues, laugh at successful trickery, and in many ways prostitute the chasteness, sobriety and dignity of their profession at the shrine of popular favor. If we are told of exceptions to this, we answer, they are solitary exceptions. If any affirm

* 1st Cor. ix. 19–23.

that their own experience does not justify this severe language, we reply that they have not gone far into the mysteries of political life, and had better not pry more deeply into them, lest they learn the truth in a too bitter experience. The past furnishes too many sad instances of the loss of influence, the wreck of principles, the degradation of life, to allow us to silence our fears, even in the presence of the largest charity we can exercise in judging of men. "Can a man take fire in his bosom, and his clothes not be burned?" "Evil communications corrupt good manners."

Moreover, the country is disgraced with a set of broken down preachers, who, shorn of reputation and stripped of influence, have resorted to politics for a refuge and a support. They are employed, because there is vile work to be done, and they are graceless and recreant enough to do it. The public estimate of reverend politicians is formed, unless under very rare circumstances, from their knowledge of this class of men. Preachers should pause long, before they consent to share the indelible stigma which attaches to this reprobate class, or to soil their reputation by even a transient association with them.

4. In times of public excitement, when passion is rampant, and the worst feelings of human nature are called out,—when even good men share in the alienations and animosities that prevail, there is absolute need for a disinterested and influential class, who can act as peace-makers. Ministers of the Gospel are the class to whom this office properly belongs. They should not, therefore, forfeit their claim to general confidence by violent partizanship.

Again: there are moral phases of political questions and political life, with which the pulpit has to deal. Often the political questions before the public relate more nearly to moral than to material interests. This will be increasingly true, as the leaven of Christian doctrine works into public opinion and public conscience. And even in the ordinary range of political action, there is much that calls for pulpit instruction. The duties which Christians owe to human governments —the sin of reviling rulers—the unbridled license given to the tongue in detraction and slander—the excitement of passion, which is allowed to deaden the soul to heavenly influences, and exile the heart from the throne of grace—the recklessness and godlessness which so abound in the midst of political agitations: these are subjects which often call for wise instruction, earnest admonition, and frequent rebuke, such as can be administered only by the man of clean hands and pure heart, who has held himself aloof from the excitements and follies of the times.

We are aware of the plea that is ready to be filed, that where min-

isters go into political contests, it is not a descent to ordinary political warfare; but is simply a discharge of religious duty, in a solemn crisis of affairs, when great wrongs are to be rebuked, and great principles of righteousness to be adovcated. We answer, that this is a plea put in by both sides; and under this plea, preachers in both the great parties at the last Presidential election, sought to justify themselves for their share in the strife. This fact is itself sufficient to condemn the plea. We yield to none in strength and earnestness of conviction on the great questions before this country and this age. We have no wish to conceal the interest we have felt in the issues of the last great contest in our land. But we are not at liberty to ignore the fact that where there are great and powerful political paaties in conflict, the worth and the truth, *par excellence*, are claimed by both, and possessed by neither. Our undivided convictions of truth and right, therefore, lose more or less of their sacredness, the moment we wed them to a party advocacy, and accept a party's fortunes. Disguise it as we may, we then become politicians—wear the insignia, drink into the spirit, and share the follies and sins of the party.—Perhaps we may do some good in the advancement of some desirable public interest;—but can we easily remove the slime of the pit into which we descended to accomplish it? Shall we ever recover the sweet odor of a name untainted with folly? Can we ever win back the hearts, which, not our principles, but our heated political animosities, have alienated.

If, in such a time, we are anxious to serve our country, there are paths of activity open which we may safely enter. There is much to be done to restrain the public mind from extremes, by the lessons of the Word of God. There is a quickening of the public conscience and a purification of the fountains of public sentiment, so as to prepare the way for a graver and more conscientious discharge of the duties of citizenship, which the pulpit can accomplish by the faithful teaching of scriptural duties. There are multitudes of sick and wounded to be cared for. There are myriads of freedmen to be fed and clothed and taught—to be saved from the horrors of starvation, and trained for the untried life on which they are entering. Is there not enough to fill the hearts and hands of all who are anxious to serve their country in these trying times—a work legitimately belonging to the ministry, and in which the blessings of multitudes ready to perish will come upon them?

We own to a peculiar sensitiveness touching the *morale* of our evangelical corps. They are, in many respects, a superior body of men—have fought long and hard for the place they have gained in public confidence; and we would not see that confidence needlessly im-

paired. We acknowledge, too, that with growing years, the dignity and sacredness of the work of an evangelist grows upon us. Its spiritual granduer so far transcends all earthly vocations, that we have to say with trembling, "Who is sufficient for these things?" It needs constant watchfulness, lest, even unwittingly, the standard-bearers in the army of the living God, fail to keep aloft the banner of salavtion, and the hosts of Israel, losing their rallying point, be bewildered and betrayed into an inglorious surrender. The enemy is subtle and vigilant. The times are perilous. Men's hearts fail them through fear. The courage and zeal of the church depends much on the singleness of purpose, and steady devotion of her ministry. It is enough to absorb the sympathies and energies of the strongest nature, to perform, with even moderate success, the duties which the present times devolve upon the preacher of the Gospel. "Be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord." I. E.

CRITICAL NOTES ON H. T. ANDERSON'S TRANSLATION.

On the term *Paraclete*, John xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7, I have to say, that I could find no word by which to represent the Greek term. I have therefore Anglicised the Greek term, and left the reader to learn the meaning from the connection, and from Webster. The Greek term παρακλητος evidently has two meanings, Comforter and Advocate, even in the above use of it. The Holy Spirit advocates the cause of the Savior, and comforts the believers. Had I adopted but one English word, *Comforter*, this would fail to express the full meaning.—*Advocate* is objectionable for the same reason. I could not use both terms; and therefore chose to Anglicise the Greek term. Webster, however, comes to my aid; for he gives to the word Paraclete the very meaning which I wish to give: "*Properly*, an advocate; one called to aid or support; hence, the consoler, comforter, or intercessor, a term applied to the Holy Spirit."

In John's First Letter, ii. 1, I have translated this Greek term by our English term *advocate*; for the sense requires it.

I had remarked that the verb αποφθεγγομαι was worthy of reconsideration. I will thank any one who will furnish me with a word that will fully express its meaning. It occurs Acts ii. 4, 14; xxvi. 25, translated by the words *utterance*, *said*, *speak forth*. Green gives, as its meaning, "To speak out, declare, particularly solemn, weighty, pithy sayings." Now we want a word which will express this. Can any one furnish such a word. Let the thoughtful reader take Peter's second discourse, and examine it carefully, and he will see what it is

αποφθεγγεσθαι. The word indeed is applicable to the Scriptures generally; for they are given to us in few words that are full of vigor, strength, power, light, and life.

In Acts v. 3, we find the words ψευσασθαι σε το πνευμα ηγιον, which I have translated, "That you should attempt to deceive the Holy Spirit." But in verse 4, ουχ εψευσω ανθροποις αλλα Θεω, which I have translated, "You have not lied to men, but to God." The reader will observe the Accusative in the former, and the Dative case in the latter. Hence the difference of meaning in the verb.

In Acts xxv. 19, we find the word δεισιδαιμονια. I have translated this word by the English term *religion*. C. V. has the word *superstition*. I suppose that Festus did not intend to speak disrespectfully. The term should, therefore, have such a meaning given to it as would not convey the idea of disrespect. The general term *religion* is, I conceive, the proper one in this place. The term is a most appropriate one in the mouth of the Roman governor.

In Acts xvii. 22, we find the word δεισιδαιμονεστερους. In this place I have given the meaning best suited to the facts as just above stated, verse 16, and to Paul's knowledge of the Gentile worship. The word, I conceive, was used by Paul in its true sense, and, at the same time, with the design to conciliate, as far as possible, his Athenian audience. My rendering is—"I perceive that in all respects your reverence for demons excels that of other men." The apostle says, 1st Cor. x. 20, "But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons, and not to God." In the Jewish mind the term *demon* had always a bad sense; not so in the Gentile mind.—What would have been exceedingly offensive to a Jew, would have been complimentary to a Gentile. So I take the word in xvii. 22.—In the Athenian sense, the unknown God was a demon, divinity.—What they supposed to be a demon, or divinity, Paul made known, not as a demon, but as the true God. In the Athenian mind, there was no difficulty in passing from the conception of a being as a divinity, to the conception of the same as the only true God. In a multitude of divinities, or demons, the mind must select some one as supreme.—Paul selected this inscription, To the unknown God, and in making him known as the God that made heaven and earth, clearly showed that there could be no other. Some of his hearers were convinced by the force of his argument, and believed. Others mocked.

We have, I think, in the above facts, a reason for that apparently singular expression in the Testimony of Luke, iv. 33, "The spirit of an unclean demon." Luke and Paul were well versed in the theological systems of the Gentiles; and hence, expressions may be found in their writings which could have no place in those of the other New

Testament writers. The term αιμων or δαιμονιον would convey to the mind of Paul, or Luke, a thought which it could not convey to the mind of Matthew, Mark, or John. A spirit may be clean or unclean.

Luke and Paul clearly understood that the δαιμονια, demons, were spirits; and, in the wider sense as known to them, they could speak of them as being unclean, leaving the reader to understand, as they did, that some might be clean. "Unclean devil," as in C. V., is utterly inadmissible: for there is but one devil, ο διαβολος, and he is also ο πονηρος, the evil one. In him evil is inherent, one of his attributes; not so, however, in the case of the demons, according to Paul and Luke. Who this Theophilus was for whom Luke makes a record of the doings and sayings of Jesus, we know not. He was not probably, a Jew; for his name has too much of Greek about it. We may learn an important lesson in the use of words by men who have become acquainted with the thoughts of the world, from the use of the above terms by Paul and Luke, who were well versed in the matters of Gentile theology,

The above terms led me farther than I intended; and, as I have mentioned them, I am led to the notice of another word of some importance, which appears in my translation, but is wholly overlooked in C. V. The word αβυσσος occurs Luke viii. 31; Rom. x. 7; Rev. ix. 1, 2, 11; xi. 7; xvii. 8; xx. 1, 3. I have translated this by our English term *abyss*. It is the name of the abode of the spirits of the dead, both good and evil. The spirits which were in the man on the borders of Gergesa, besought Jesus not to send them into the abyss, which is the place of punishment. They also asked Jesus if he had come to torment them before the time. Satan is thrown, Rev. xx. 3, into the abyss. The angel that came down from heaven had in his hand the key of the abyss. In Rev. xvii. 8, xi. 7, the beast came out of the abyss. In ix. 1, one has the key of the pit of the abyss; he opens the pit of the abyss, and a smoke rises out of the pit. In Rom. x. 7, "Who shall descend into the abyss? that is, to bring Christ again from the dead."

Now it is evident that the term *abyss* is the general name for the place of departed spirits. The soul of the Savior was in the abyss. The pit of the abyss is that portion in which the spirits of the wicked are, and in which they will be tormented, and into which Satan will be thrown. The term *abyss* is equal to the term *hades*. The pit of the abyss is equal to Tartarus. See Peter's Second Letter, ii. 4.

C, V. has unfortunately overlooked the meaning of this term.

The words ο Ναζωραιος have throughout my Translation their true sense—The Nazarene. Ο απο Ναζαρετ has another sense—who is of Nazareth.

In Matt. ii. 1, the words *τον χρονον του φαινομενου αστερος*, I have translated with freedom, in order to express the sense. The common version, "What time the star appeared, expresses only a part of the sense. The article with *φαινομενου* must be translated. Literally, it would be, "The time of the appearing star." This would not be intelligible to an English reader. The star was then visible, as the Greek *του φαινομενου* makes evident. Herod wished to know at what time the star, then visible, made its appearance. I have, therefore, expressed the full sense as follows: "At what time the star, then visible, first made its appearance." This is an expansion of the words, "The time of the visible star."

H. T. Anderson.

ROMISH DEVELOPMENTS IN OUR COUNTRY.

The man that supposes that Popery can be reformed, or that in any way it can be brought to harmonize with modern, Christian ideas of freedom and equality, knows really nothing about the heart and soul of this Mystic Babylon. First, the Pope and the great writers and defenders of Popery deny any such a reformation as either necessary, allowable, or possible. The great battle of Romanism for the last centuries has been *against* all such modern liberal ideas. *Nil novi*, nothing new, is the ever-more repeated maxim of the Pontiffs, one after the other, as they come and go. When any application is made to his Holiness for any radical improvement, either in church or state, such as an enlightened world now demands, his uniform stereotyped answer is, *non possumus*, 'we cannot.' Secondly, all history harmonizes with these declarations of the Papacy. It witnesses on every page of the history of this sacerdotal power, that absolute tyranny, a union of church and State, in which the latter rules the former, is alone the normal idea of Romanism. This Schlegel declared in his famous lectures in Vienna; this the Jesuits announced to the king of Naples; this is the accepted ecclesiastico-political dogma of all true papists. Witness the present fierce struggle of the Pope for his absolute temporal power; witness the fact that all the ultramontane, truly devoted Popish journals and bishops of the whole world, sustain him in this. Bishop Hughes of New York wrote boldly in favor of it, even in free enlightened America; and in the late missive of the Pope to all Bishops, this is one of the eighteen points to be insisted on and prayed for by them. A man educated in the true spirit of Popery cannot understand any state of society and government, where the church is not the one favored, controlling idea, absorbing the life of everything else. Gregory XVI, the predecessor of the

present pope, in his encyclical letter of August 15th 1832 says: "The divine authority of the church is weakened, robbed of her rights."—"Hence it is that men, flinging away the restraint of our Holy Religion, which alone can keep together the elements of kingdoms, and impart strength and stability to government, have brought us to witness the distraction of public order, the downfall of States, and the overthrow of all legitimate power."—"Nor can we augur more consoling consequences to religion and to government, from the zeal of some to separate the church from the State, and to burst the bond which unites the priesthood to the Empire. For it is clear that this union is dreaded by the profane lover of liberty, only because it has never failed to confer prosperity on both."—"May this our zeal for the welfare of religious and public order, acquire aid and authority from the princes, our dearest sons in Christ, who, let them reflect, have received their power not merely for their temporal rule, but chiefly for the protection of the church. Let them carefully observe, that whatever is done for the good of the church, necessarily benefits their government and confirms the peace of their States. Let them be persuaded that the cause of the faith interests them more nearly than that of their kingdom; and let them weigh the vast importance to themselves (we speak with St. Leo, the sovereign Pontiff,) 'that to the crown of faith should be added the diadem which they have received from the hand of God.'" This language of Pope Gregory is not to be mistaken. But what has this to do with American Bishops and Catholics?—does it reach them? The title and address of this document is the following: 'Encyclical Letter of our Most Holy Father, Pope Gregory, by Divine Providence, the sixteenth of the name, addressed to all Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops.' It applies, therefore, to the American Romish priesthood as well as to that of Spain or Italy. Besides, note the following passage from this same letter. "Let all remember that the principles of sound doctrine, with which the people are to be imbued, must emanate from, and that the rule and the administration of the Universal Church belongs to, the Roman Pontiff, to whom was delivered 'the full power of feeding, ruling and governing the Universal Church, by Christ our Lord,' as the Fathers of the Council of Florence have unequivocally declared. It is the duty of all Bishops, then, to adhere most faithfully to the chair of St Peter, to preserve their deposit holily and religiously, and to feed God's flock entrusted to them." But the oath which all the Catholic Bishops have to take puts this matter beyond all controversy It is this:

"With my whole strength I shall observe and cause to be observed by others, the rules of the Holy Father, the decrees, ordinances or

dispositions, reservations, provisions and mandates of the Apostolic see. According to my ability I shall pursue and impugn (attack) heretics, schismatics, and rebels against our good Lord, or his successors as aforesaid."

The Romish Priesthood, then, of the United States must, under the awful pains and penalties of excommunication, accept and fully adhere to the above quoted doctrines of the Pontiff.

But may not the Romish Church reform in this or in other respects? This is the question of ignorant, thoughtless men. We might quote from Councils, Pontifical decrees, and Popish writers, to show that such an idea is abhorrent to the Roman Catholic faith. A passage from this *Encyclical*, however, must suffice, as it comes directly from the Pope himself. "It is no less absurd than injurious to her that anything by way of 'Restoration,' or 'Regeneration,' should be forced upon her as necessary for her soundness or increase, as if she could be thought obnoxious to decay, or to obscurites, or any other such inconveniences." The idea of any change, then, or modification in the doctrine and decrees of the Papacy is out of the question. Her boasted motto is *semper eadem*, 'ever the same'!

The Popish doctrine, that the church has a right—indeed, the only divine exclusive right, to lay all Society and all governments under tribute for her good and behoof, is nowhere given up by this church. If anywhere she does not exercise this right, it is because she cannot. Wherever she can do it, she does it to the utmost extent of her power. The very first opportunity that offers itself to her to assert and make use of this 'right,' (see quotations above,) she eagerly lays hold of, and step by step, stealthily but surely aims at preeminence. If she can do it during periods of excitement, when men's eyes are not upon her, or by making use of the passions of men, with Jesuitical skill she pushes her chance to the utmost limit.

What we have thus far written will enable us fully to understand and appreciate the following facts in the current history of Romanism in the United States. With reference to the first fact introduced, we simply say, that St. Francis Xavier was one of the first leaders of the Jesuits, and the St Francis Xavier Colleges in this country (for there are several) are under the control of the Jesuits.

In an article on *Municipal Patronage of Religious Sects*, the *N. Y. Journal of Commerce* says:

"The appropriation of $5 000 to the St. Francis Xavier College of this city by the Common Council, is exciting much comment among tax-payers without regard to their religious beliefs or political preferences. * * * * When it comes to patronizing in this expensive way, an institution belonging and devoted exclusively to one church organization, from a participation in whose benefits a great

portion, probably a large majority, of our citizens are excluded, no just and reflecting man can fail to remark its exceedingly pernicious effects. As a precedent, nothing could be worse. For, if the Catholic college of St. Francis Xavier should have $5,000 from the city funds, why should not the colleges, academies and private schools of every other religious denomination in the city receive an equal amount? There is probably not one among them that cannot make out as strong an appeal for municipal charity as the St. Francis Xavier. To carry out such an immense scheme of unsystematic and irrational benevolence, would take a number of million of dollars a year, and still leave all the recipients unsatisfied. To be consistent in their generous folly, and treat all the denominations alike, would be to bankrupt the city. To confer these favors on one religious sect and not give a penny to any of the others, would arouse an unpleasant state of feeling among those who are thus shut out from the public treasury, not only against the Common Council but against the sect which is thus favored at the expense of all the others."

The *N. Y. Daily Times* commenting on the same fact says:

"After the Common Council have voted $5.000 of the people's taxes to a purely sectarian institution, such as the College of St. Francis Xavier; after liberal gifts to all Roman Catholic charities, such as $30,000 to the 'St. Joseph's Asylum,' $15.000 to the 'Society for destitute Catholic Children,' and within a few days $2.000 to a certain unknown industrial school of a 'Sister Theresa,' in Forty-second street; while just about to spend $3,000 on engrossing a copy of their own resolutions upon Archbishop Hughes' death—they are suddenly brought to a fit of economy by a simple proposal, coming from some of our best citizens." * * * * * *

"We trust that this whole method of our city legislature in distributing its donations, will be looked into closely by the Legislature.—If Roman Catholic Asylums and Jesuit Colleges are alone to share in the charity-donations, raised by city taxes, toward which the Protestant community pay nine-tenths of the amount, that body should know it, and act accordingly."

When Archbishop Hughes died, this same proverbially corrupt, venal, vote-begging Common Council of New York, beyond all doubt to flatter the Irish Catholic population of that city, voted a 'Memorial' to His Grace, at a cost to the city of about $3,000. The secret of all this is, that although the Catholics are by far but a minority of the population of that city, yet by playing on the base chord of political influence, they have already managed to secure half of the city council to the 'church,' besides four of the most lucrative offices of the city; and more of these officials, who are not 'of the church,' are politically under its influence.

How far the Popish priesthood have already advanced in *asserting* and *obtaining* the 'rights' which Holy Mother, in her protecting care, demands and secures for them, may be seen by the following statement in the *N. Y. Daily Tribune*:

"There are some things the religious and thinking public will wink at, under existing circumstances, though they may think them wrong *per se*; but there are other things they will not wink at or tolerate. And it behooves the government to beware how it trifles with the patriotism of the Protestant community. We ask the question, and we ask it emphatically, why are Protestant clergymen compelled, when drafted, to respond, personally, or by substiutes, while Roman Catholic priests are not required to serve, or supply substitutes? For instance, two Catholic priests were drafted at Bardstown, Ky., in September, but the Secretary of War ordered that they "be not called on to report for service."

"Second instance, still later, four priests, members of the St. Louis University (Rev. John L'Esperance, Joseph E. Heiley, John T. H. Sealer, and John W. O'Neil), were drafted at St. Louis, Mo.—when lo! an order was sent to the Provost-Marshal of that city, releasing them on parole, to report when called on, to the Secretary of War!

"Why should Roman Catholic priests receive such immunities from the draft? What have they done, as a class, to uphold the government in its struggles for life? Protestant clergymen, by the hundreds, have been drafted, and responded, either personally, or by substitutes. No offer of immunity was ever made to them, though many cases have been of the most trying kind. But they claim no immunity from the draft, and all they demand is that Catholic priests shall be subject to the same rule. Partiality will not be tolerated, and in their demands for equal justice they will be backed energetically by the whole lay force. Congress should take the matter in hand."

This is surely outrageous enough. We think it beyond comment. That politicians, whether of the lowest stratum, such as herd together from the wards of New York City, in the Common Council chamber, or even of a higher order, neither understand nor care for the high-handed, arrogant, ambitious, anti-republican demands of the Catholic church, of course is not the least surprising. Here follows, however, the climax. Here come these loving, gentle beings, the 'Sisters of Charity'—those kind, unambitious creatures, that are so humble that they scarcely venture to lift their modest, lowly eyes from the ground. The journal of the U. S. Senate has this on its record:

"PETITION FROM THE SISTERS OF CHARITY.

"Mr Hale, of N. Hampshire, (in the Senate,) presented the petition of the Mother Superintendent of the Sisters of Charity, stating that, by the discipline of the order, the Sisters are obliged to wear a uniform of a certain description, manufactured only in France, upon which the duties are so hig that they are unable to pay them, and asking a a reduction of these duties.

"The petition was referred to the Commitee on Finance."

We blame not Mr. Hale for presenting this most impudent petition. We are glad that he did. It will open the eyes of the American people, we trust. Our noble Protestant women, who, unwearied in their mission of love and mercy, have labored, are laboring, and will do

so to the end, in administering to the wants of our armies in the field and in the hospitals; these blessed *angels* of mercy, whose names are numbered by the thousand; our Protestant women, *wives and mothers*, whose earthly stay is away in the tented field, wasting away in prison, dying in hospitals, or under the sod, must buy the garments for themselves and children—their sable garments of mourning for the fallen—at the current prices that the wants of the nation demand. But these 'Sisters of Charity,' abundantly provided for by the material resources of the Catholic church, and largely so by contributions from our European enemies,—by the Papists of the Old World, that would rejoice in the ruin of the liberties of this nation,—these are to buy their uniforms free from tariff duties! But the blind arrogance of these minds, besotted with Romish superstition, bigotry, and overbearing pride, overleaps itself, as it has frequently done, here and elsewhere. We have no fears that this absurd and impudent petition will be granted. But we are glad that Popery is letting itself be seen in its true character. *Ubique et semper eadem*—'everywhere and evermore the same.' This is the proud motto of Rome—let us not forget it.

A few days since, a Rev. Mr. Hecker, a Catholic priest, at St. Stephen's church, New York, in a lecture there delivered, labored to show that this government, as all others, needed a religion to support it; that the religion that should be accepted by it, is the Catholic; and that this religion 'had the pre-eminent right to be acknowledged as the creed best adapted to the wants of the nation.' Let the American Protestants understand this: one religion is needed to *support* our government, and that is the Roman Catholic! This harmonizes perfectly with what we quoted above from Pope Gregory's *Encyclical*.

The Roman Catholic apologists in the United States, in order to blind the eyes of the nation and secure its good will, have not hesitated to adopt the universal plan of deception that characterizes the Man of Sin everywhere. In every country these apologists, thoroughly Jesuitic in this respect, labor to show that *their* religion is most favorable to the existing form of government. In absolute monarchies they exhaust their dialectic skill to prove that Popery is the mightiest support, while Protestantism is subversive, of autocratic rule. In the constitutional monarchies of Europe, they are ceaselessly engaged in convincing the rulers that their religion is the only safe one for the throne. So here, we have heard again and again from these men that Romanism is the chosen, only stay and guaranty of republican liberty. The barefacedness of this enormous falsehood is really amazing. But they seek to blind the eyes of Americans, by referring proudly to the fact that in Italy, Roman Catholic republics existed before Amer-

ica was even known. They very well know the deception they practice in this argument. They know that in these Italian republics *Church and State were always united.* It is so even in *American* Catholic republics. If the Popish Power can but secure its dominion in the State, it is satisfied. This is its one great aim, for which it ceaselessly, unweariedly, and *everywhere* labors. The great Hildebrand is its ideal in this respect. To put its foot on the necks of all governors and governments, as that Pope did on the neck of the Emperor of Germany, it regards as its divine, legitimate 'right'—which to this day it has never yielded in theory, whatever it has been forced to submit to in fact. Let not the American people be deceived, but jealously watch this insidious power of evil.

But what, in view of the notorious character and scheming of Popery, are we to think of the blind and fatal obstinacy of Protestant American fathers and mothers, who willingly consign, by way of choice, their daughters, the most susceptible, and, therefore, to the Papist, the most acceptable members of their families, to Popish Seminaries to be educated? Do the misguided people not yet understand the character and purposes of Rome? Do they not yet see into the object of these female Seminaries? If so, it is an unpardonable blindness, a blindness amid the noonday light that the history of centuries has thrown and is throwing upon the Jesuitical purposes of these Seminaries among Protestants. In Europe, where Catholicism is better known, Protestant parents do not commit this folly, so common here. In the history of European governments, it is well known that Popery always labors to its utmost power to secure the control of the educational systems of the nations, as a most efficient means of proselytism. It is not our desire to lengthen out this article, already too long; but from the great importance of the matter, we feel justified in adding a few quotations from Catholic writers on the very subject of these American Seminaries, after making some extracts from the 'rules' of the latter. In Georgetown, D. C., "The exercises of religious worship are Catholic. It is required that members of other religious denominations assist at the public duties of religion with their companions." At the Athenæum in Cincinnati, "It is not deemed an infringement of liberty that all our pupils should assist together at religious exercises." At St. Joseph's College, Bardstown, Ky., all the students have to attend at morning and evening prayers daily, and *catechism* and divine service on Lord's day and holy days. The *Annales*, a wide-spread and vigorously edited French Catholic missionary journal in Europe, years ago published the following about Catholic Seminaries in America: "Mr. Flaget has established many convents of nuns in his diocese, devoted to the

education of young females. These establishments do wonderful good. Catholics and Protestants are admitted indiscriminately. The latter, after having finished their education, return to the bosom of their friends, full of esteem and veneration for their instructresses.—They are ever ready to refute the calumnies which the jealousy of heretics loves to spread against the religious communities; and often, when they have no longer any opposition of their relatives to fear, they embrace the Catholic religion."

From the Bishop of Bardstown, Ky., this journal has the following, which we commend especially to the Protestants in Kentucky who support Catholic schools: "Had I treasures at my disposal, I would multiply colleges and schools for boys and girls: I would consolidate all these establishments by annexing to them lands on annual rents; I would build hospitals and public houses; in a word, I would compel all my Kentuckians to admire and love a religion so beneficial and generous, and perhaps I should finish by converting them." * * "I have the greatest confidence we shall be able in a short time to liquidate our debts; and shall then have the opportunity of educating gratis a much larger number of pupils in our Seminary, for the good of the church in Kentucky." * * * "The conversions are numerous. In twelve Jubilees, where I have presided, more than forty Protestants have entered the church; a great number still are preparing to share the same happiness, and I have hardly gone over the half of Kentucky."

These quotations, taken from that admirable discourse, *Dr. L. Beecher's Plea for the West*, and dating as far back as 1830, must open the eyes of every man not willfully and perversely blind, as to the aims of Romanism in these Seminaries. They constitute one of the most potent engines of Popery to bring society under its control.—Education and predominant municipal and political influence, constitute the great reliance of this dark power here as everywhere else.—For the sake of all that as a Protestant free people we cherish most, let us watch this evil power by day and by night, with sleepless vigilance, and not yield a hair's breadth to its arrogant, tyrannous demands.

C. L. L.

Ecclesiastical Titles cast away.—Spurgeon has renounced the title of *Reverend*, and refuses any title but his own name. The Rev. Simeon Howard Calhoun, of the American Board in Syria, has declined the degree of D. D., conferred on him by Williams College, on the ground that "the holding of such marks of distinction is not in accordance with the spirit of our Lord's teaching, nor with the sound principles of purity in the Christian ministry."

SKEPTICAL DIFFICULTIES.

Prof. W. K. Pendleton—*Dear Brother:*—I am glad to see, that in your programme for the current volume, 1865, you purpose paying some attention to skepticism, and to the evidences on which rests the claim of the Bible to a divine original. I think the advocates of the Christian religion in general, are inexcusably derelict on this point.

You also court inquiry, and promise to pay particular attention to the querist's department. At the close of your remarks under the head, *Exposition of Scriptures, embracing answers to Queries, &c.*, you say: "We invite inquiry, and shall spare no pains to make our answers to queries thorough and complete." These considerations have emboldened me to mail you the following skeptical difficulties, to which I invite your special attention, and which I hope you will have the kindness, as I doubt not you have the ability, to obviate.

Sincerity.

"1. The account of Herod destroying all the children in and around Bethlehem, under two years old, is related only by Matthew; not one of the other three evangelists mentions it. Now it seems to me, that the importance and universality of this matter must have made it known to them all; and it would have been too striking to have been omitted by any one of them. Matthew says, Jesus escaped by being warned of an angel, and fleeing into Egypt; but John was then under two years old—he was left behind, and yet, he fared as well as Jesus, who fled."

Answer.—The silence of the three other Evangelists concerning this event must go for nothing. They are equally so as to other events, and *must* be so, or else the three histories would be substantially one. Each of the historians treats the history of our Savior according to his own spiritually guided judgment—introducing or omitting, in whole or in part, incidents of this history, according to the special use that he wishes to make of them. This event is named by Matthew, doubtless, because of its bearing upon the Messianic question, the doctrine of "the Christ," which he is so particular to enforce upon the Jews, for whom, specially, he wrote. He saw in it a fulfillment of prophecy, which helped to identify Jesus, the son of Mary, with the expected son of David, for whom the Jews were so anxiously waiting. In itself, the event was not perhaps at the time a matter of very general public interest. In all probability the massacre was secretly executed, for it seems from Herod's intercourse with the Magi, that he went very cunningly to work in order to get possession of the person of the new-born King. (Ch. 2. 7.) It cre-

ated great lamentation among the people immediately affected by it, but having no political bearing, it would excite but little general interest outside of this circle.

We are prone to exaggerate the public importance that was attached to this instance of Herod's cruelty, perhaps, from the want of familiarity with the horrible brutality of his character. Bethlehem was a small town. The number of males under two years old, in it and its suburbs, would be small; and their massacre, by such a monster as Herod, would attract but little general notice. On this account it might well be passed over by the historians of the day, as unworthy of record. Josephus would make no allusion to it, as a matter of course, because it would have compelled him to speak of Christ, which he ever studiously avoids.

Matthew mentions it, then, because he finds in it a prophetic argument, to prove that Jesus is the Christ—the promised Messiah—the expected King of the Jews, to whom especially he writes. The other Evangelists omit it, simply because, for the purposes of their narratives, they did not judge it necessary or pertinent. Many incidents in the life of Jesus had to be omitted, of course: but each historian selected out of the mass, (which John says, if they were written, the world could not contain,) such as to him seemed necessary to his special aim,—which was, that the *persons addressed* "might believe."—Profane historians generally, would not regard it as anything more than one of many specimens of Herod's cruelty, and therefore pass it by as having no relation to the general thread of history; and Josephus, who deals very fully with the acts of Herod in other respects, would omit this, because of its relation to Christ, whom he is particular, because of his Jewish prejudices, never to mention in any way.

As to the escape of John, the explanation is so plain, that nothing but ignorance, such as but too generally characterizes the cavils of Infidels, could have raised the question. The parents of John the Baptist did not live in Bethlehem, nor in its environs. Luke tells us that they lived in "the hill country in a city of Juda" (ch. 1, 39). Whether we regard this city as Hebron, or Juttah (Josh. xxi. 11, 16), it was some distance from Bethlehem, and could not have been embraced in the order of Herod.

"2. Concerning the superscription which was placed over Christ when he was crucified: no two of these writers agree in reciting it *verbatim*. Matthew says, "This is Jesus, the King of the Jews"; Mark gives it, "The King of the Jews"; Luke relates it, "This is the King of the Jews"; John records it, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews." Now it would seem reasonable, from

these circumstances, that those writers were not present at the scene, and only got it from hearsay. The only one of the apostles who seems to have been there, was Peter; and when he was accused of being one of Christ's disciples, "*he began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man*"; yet, we must believe this same Peter, convicted of perjury!"

ANSWER.—Exact verbal conformity is not to be expected, as it is never found in independent narrations. It would be ground for serious objection to these histories, if they always adopted the same words in describing the same events. Skeptics would say, the authors copied from one another, and are worthy of no credit as independent witnesses. On the other hand, the style of the New Testament writers is remarkably free. Even in the use of the Old Testament Scriptures, they but seldom employ an exact translation of the words of the authors whom they quote, either as they are found in the Hebrew or the Greek. They give the sense—the cardinal idea—the particular thought of a passage, which is pertinent to their object, and use the utmost freedom in the form of words by which they will express it. Unquestionably there is a difference in the versions which are given us of this superscription. But the difference is not peculiar to this case. It is the common rule of the whole New Testament. The difference cannot be used to prove that the different writers had never seen the superscription, any more than the difference between their quotations of the Old Testament Scriptures and the original, can be used as a proof that they had never seen these Scriptures.—That they had seen them, we know; they had read them—had access to them—and if they had deemed it important, could have turned to them and copied their exact language; but they did not, merely because they did not judge it necessary. So in this case. They were concerned only to give that which constituted the significant feature of this superscription, and that was the fact, that Jesus was crucified as "the King of the Jews." This we think is the true solution of this matter. But there is another, to which we may refer, as also sufficient to explain this shallow cavil of skepticism. This superscription was written in *three* different languages, and may have been expressed differently by each. The probability is, they were written by different scribes, and each may have adopted a slightly different style of expressing the *Titulus*, or *accusation*, on which Jesus was condemned. Say then that Matthew quoted from the Hebrew; Luke and Mark from the Latin; and John from the Greek; and we have a solution, at once probable and adequate,—and this is all that the objector in this case, has a logical right to demand.

The inference, that Peter was the only one of the apostles that was

there, betrays an ignorance of the Scriptures, that illy becomes one who sets himself to impeach their historical accuracy. John, the beloved disciple, we know was there; for our Savior addressed him from the cross, and committed his mother to his keeping. "Woman, behold thy son," says he; and to the disciple, "Behold thy mother." (John 19. 26, 27.) Besides this, Luke expressly says, "All his acquaintance, and the women that followed him from Galilee, stood afar off, beholding these things" (Luke 23. 49). The inference, therefore, is not only not justified by the premises, but is directly in the face of the recorded facts.

"3. Mark tells us that he (Jesus) was crucified at the third hour; and John says it was the sixth hour. According to John, the sentence was not passed till about the sixth hour, or noon; but Mark expressly declares that he was crucified at the third hour, or about nine o'clock in the morning."

Answer.—For this difficulty there are two solutions, either of which may satisfy the objection. First—It is claimed, and sustained by high authority, that in Jno. 19. 14, instead of *ektee* (ἕκτη) *the sixth*, we should read *tritee* (τρίτη), *the third*. The mistake, it is alleged, is one that might readily be made in copying, since the numerals *sixth* and *third* were expressed by Greek letters of the alphabet, which were very much alike. Let any one compare the Greek letters *gamma*, equal *three*, and *stigma*, equal *six*, and he will readily admit that such a mistake might easily arise, in copying from manuscripts, in which these letters may not have been formed with sufficient care to make them clearly distinguishable from one another.

The second solution is however more satisfactory to those critics who think that the true meaning of the original, in John, is *ektee*, or *sixth*. It is this:—John, in expressing the time of day, used the Roman style, while Mark used the Jewish style. According to the Roman style, the day was counted from midnight to midnight. The sixth hour would therefore be six o'clock in the morning, expressed in the Roman style, or fifteen or twenty minutes after sunrise at that time of year. The Jews, on the other hand, divided the day, from sunrise to sunset, into twelve hours, and the *third* hour would be three hours after sunrise, or about 9 o'clock in the morning of our time. Now let it be noticed that John gives the hour of pronouncing the sentence, and Mark the hour of actual crucifixion, and we have no difficulty in harmonizing the two statements. According to Matthew, there must, indeed, have been some time between the sentence and the execution, to allow of the cruel and fiendish persecutions which he describes (ch. 27. 27-31) as having taken place in "the common

hall," and on the way to Golgotha. After the sentence, say six o'clock in the morning, according to Matthew, the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the common hall, stripped him, put on him a scarlet robe, mocked him, took the robe off from him and put on him his own raiment, and then led him away to be crucified. The way to the spot of his execution was thronged and tedious, and the incidents of the journey tended to protract the time consumed in traveling it. The fainting under the burthen of the cross, the impressment of Simon, the ceremony of the preparatory bitter draft, and the hindrances natural to the movements of so confused and vast a crowd of disorderly and infuriated people, all conspired to consume time, and hinder the speedy execution of the Savior. Agreeing, then, with Mark, that he was crucified at 9 o'clock (the *third* hour) it would seem almost necessary to assume, in harmony with this interpretation of John, that his sentence was pronounced some three hours before, or at six o'clock in the morning, the *sixth* hour from midnight, counting according to the Roman style."

"4. The history of the circumstances attending the crucifixion are related differently in these four books. Matthew says, "From the sixth hour there was darkness throughout the land, till the ninth."—Again: "Behold the vail was torn in two from top to bottom, and the rocks rent, and the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of their graves after his resurrection, and went into the Holy City, and appeared unto many." Mark, in relating the circumstances connected with the crucifixion, makes no allusion whatever, to the earthquake, the rending of the rocks, the graves opening, nor the dead men being brought to life. Luke is also silent upon these points. But John, although he details all the circumstances of the crucifixion, down to Christ's burial, says nothing about the darkness, the vail of the temple, the rocks, the graves, nor the dead men."

Answer.—We cannot see in this difficulty anything that needs more than a passing notice. We have already shown why these narratives are not and ought not to be mere copies of one another. The fact that one writer chooses to omit some things that another has thought proper to tell, proves nothing. This must be the case, or else all the gospels would virtually be one. Surely these writers did not suppose that this identity in their narratives was necessary, or they would have put themselves to some pains to have constructed them after this rule. It is admitted by competent critics, that John's gospel was written after the rest, and that he had seen and was familiar with them; and yet his narrative is more widely different from all

these, than are they from one another. He could have made it a mere reiteration of what they had already told, and if he had had the fear of modern cavilers before his eyes, perhaps he would have done so; —but on the contrary, he seems purposely to have avoided this feature, in the method of his work, and to have made it, from settled design, characteristically *different*, though still, not *contradictory*. Matthew writes with especial reference to the Jews, and chooses his facts accordingly. None of them, we may presume, tells all that happened.

"5. In reference to the resurrection, Matthew says: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, to see the sepulcher."—Mark says it was *sun-rising*, and John says it was *dark*. Luke says it was Mary of Magdala, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women, that came to the sepulcher; and John says that Mary Magdalene came alone. The book of Matthew proceeds: "And behold, there was a great earthquake, for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it." But the other books say nothing about the earthquake, nor about rolling the stone back and sitting upon it; and according to their account, there was no angel sitting there. Mark says the angel was *within* the sepulcher, sitting on the right side; Luke says there were two, and they were both *standing up*; and John says they were both sitting down."

Answer.—A perfectly satisfactory harmony of all the details that are given us of these wonderfully exciting events, is difficult to make out, simply because of our ignorance of many connecting links, which are not given to us. How often does it happen that, when several persons give us versions of some important events, we think we see in them irreconcilable discrepancies, when a single explanation from the parties makes all plain and harmonious. Many scholars and students have given us arrangements of these events, that are plausible, and sufficient to relieve the narratives of any necessary inference of error in their statements. Lightfoot, Lardner, West, Townson, Newcome, Da Costa, Greswell, Ebrard, Robinson, and others, have attempted, with more or less success, to clear up the confusion. As among the best of these efforts, we present the reader with that of Lange, which, if not above improvement, is at least ingenious and adequate:

"1. *The first Easter morning.*—Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome, proceed to the grave, Mark 16, 1. They are to be followed (see Luke) by the other women, who are bringing the

spices and ointments. The three who thus went in advance, behold the stone rolled away, and are affected in quite different ways by the sight. The narrative now divides into two portions.

"*Excitement and ecstasy seize upon Mary Magdalene.* She hurries into the city (*and towards the male disciples*), reports the facts to Peter and John; hurries back again, sees two angels in the grave, and afterwards the Lord. She brings then the message to the disciples.—Meanwhile Peter and John have arrived at the grave, and found it empty.

"*Mary the mother of James, and Salome*, at the sight of the removed stone, collect themselves, advance more closely, and see *an angel* sitting upon the stone. The Easter message of the angel. They hurry back in great fear and joy (*and towards the female disciples*), long undecided whether they will announce what they had seen or not. And, in this state, they meet the other women, who are bringing the ointments. All together now visit the empty tomb of Jesus, where they now (see Luke) behold *two angels*, as the Magdalene had done before. After they had started back to the city, they were met by the Lord.

"Besides, in the course of the day, Peter also had a manifestation. Hence, three messages from the risen Savior—three from the empty grave."

This harmony of the statements of the several Evangelists is quite conceivable, and this is all that can be demanded in the case. These difficulties are like those mechanical puzzles, with which we amuse our children, in which a number of curiously shaped pieces are to be put together, so as to fit and make one symmetrical whole. Those who have but little ingenuity and less patience soon throw the problem aside, with the hasty judgment that it is impossible, but others of more faith and perseverance keep studying and trying, till at last every part finds its appropriate place, and the whole is made to form one symmetrical and harmonious figure.

After all, what are these difficulties? Not even spots on the sun; they are only defects in the critic's vision. Even if they were all that skepticism claims for them, they would not dim the lustre of the light by which Christianity forces itself upon our conviction; but as it is, they only serve to reveal the evil heart of unbelief, which seeks for excuses for its infidelity, rather than the discovery of the truth.—Where the intellect is kept so busy in looking for the false, there is but little hope of discerning the true, and with the head so subsidized by the prejudices of skepticism, we cannot expect to find the heart free for the exercise of faith.

We conclude with the single reflection, that if it were not for this

very diversity, which is complained of, there would be strong ground to suspect, that the writers were all in connivance with one another, and therefore utterly unworthy of credit. As it is, they stand before us as independent witnesses,—speaking with a freedom and originality, that proves them to be conscious of the necessary harmony that must exist in their testimony, since they speak of the same things and speak only what is true. No one fears that his story may contradict that of some other, because he knows that truth must be consistent with itself and can involve no necessary contradiction. Let us then rather lament our own ignorance, than cavil at the difficulties which it creates, and, thankful for the light we have, cease to shut our eyes because there is not more. Christianity still demands the exercise of faith, and requires us to prefer light, rather than darkness. The way is indeed so plain that the wayfaring man *need* not err therein, but it is still not so plain that he *can* not err. Real skepticism is still possible, but only through the wilfulness of an evil heart.

W. K. P.

SKETCHES FROM A PASTOR'S PORT-FOLIO.—NO. X.

TRIALS AND DELIVERANCES.

About this time Alexander Campbell visited our place. The theological fame that had preceded him was not an enviable one. His separation from the Baptists, and the havoc made in Baptist ranks by his principles had excited violent prejudices against him. An application was made for our house of worship, for the delivery of a few discourses. I was aware that to give my consent to the use of the house would put the church in danger of new agitations. But God had been teaching me to look to *duty*, not to *consequences*; and I was resolved to practice the lesson. I had occasionally heard sermons from the preachers among the reformers; and although, there was much that was eccentric and *outre*, yet their acquaintance with the Scriptures, and their simple way of preaching had pleased me much. They were men, generally, of but little culture, but possessing strong native sense, good reasoning power, and ready utterance; and some of them were endowed with fine oratorical abilities. Their revolutionary plea made them too fond of debate; their early habits gave some of them an undesirable levity of speech and manner; and the treatment they received sometimes made them forget "the meekness and gentleness of Christ." But they were men of power, "mighty in the Scriptures," and mighty in their assaults on the sanctified errors of the age. I admired their boldness, their freedom from clerical as-

sumption, their simple unaffected piety, and above all, their reverence for the Word of God. I was therefore better prepared than many of my brethren to do justice to Mr. Campbell. The call I made on him gave me a favorable impression of his learning, ability and piety. His conversational powers are very superior. He is genial, witty, piquant, and highly instructive in the social circle. Through my influence with the Trustees, our house was granted. I attended the course of Lectures. Mr. C. is not, in the highest sense, an orator. Indeed he seems to me rather to despise a reliance on external aids, and to depend on the intrinsic charms and merits of the message he delivers. His fine, manly form did not appear to best advantage as he stood leaning on his cane through a discourse of two hours' length. But his calm dignity, his keen eye, massive brows, highly iniellectual forehead, elegance of expression, reverential manner, and great weight of argument, secured the profoundest attention of his auditors. He is the most eloquent *reasoner* I ever heard. Perhaps he seemed the more so to me, from the fact that he dealt with my theological difficulties, and led me out from my perplexities into clear and satisfactory conclusions, with so much ease, that I wondered I had not always seen it so. I was so much absorbed in his teachings, that I forgot his person, manner, and all external objects. His views of the Three Dispensations—the proper division of the New Testament—the setting up of the Kingdom—the nature of Faith—and the scriptural evidence of pardon, poured in a flood of light on my soul; that will ever lead me to esteem his visit one of the epochs of my life. But his sermon on the Divinity of the Messiah was the *chef-d'œuvre* of all these glorious discourses. He had been branded with Unitarianism. My heart fairly leaped for joy as he unfolded the personal dignity, sacrificial death, and official power and glory of the Son of God. This, I am sure, is his favorite theme; for here, more than anywhere, his heart came out in lively sympathy with his subject; and the *unction* of the sermon was rich and rare. One of the finest exhibitions of pulpit oratory I have ever witnessed, was his description of the ascension and coronation of the Messiah. He laid aside his cane, and, rapt in the inspirations of his theme, gave himself away to the sublime grandeur of the coronation scene. Without a full assent to all his positions, and with some objections to what seems to me an unnecessary degree of radicalism in his plea for reformation, I gratefully record my impressions of these invaluable discourses, and of this extraordinary man. His visit has dissipated many clouds that skirted gloomily my spiritual horizon, and has led to an extent of Bible reading and religious inquiry, in this community, unknown be-

fore. I hope to be better able hereafter to preach the simple "truth as it is in Jesus."

Soon after this the scarlet fever, of a very malignant type, visited our town. Its epidemical rage was very fatal, especially among children. Scarcely a family escaped. Night and day, I was kept busy among the sick, the dying, and the bereaved. Some of the cases were extremely afflicting. In one instance, a father and mother, buried all their children. Their mute despair, as they stood by the grave of the last child, like trunks of trees which tempests and lightnings have stripped of all their branches, was the most touching eloquence of grief. In another case, four little children followed their parents to the grave, and saw them laid side by side in their last sleep. The outburst of sympathy from the crowd, as they looked on these helpless orphans, was such as I never before witnessed. But it called out also a true generosity. Those who had been made childless adopted those who had been left parentless, and led them from the grave to warm, bright homes, promising, for the sake of their own lost darlings, to treat them tenderly, even as their own.

While thus engaged ministering to others,—my wife and elder children also devoting themselves entirely to the wants of the distressed,—the shadow of the destroyer crossed our own threshold. Our darling EDITH—a bright girl of seven years, was the first victim. I had never known a real grief before. "The sorrows of death compassed me, and the pains of hell got hold upon me: I found trouble and sorrow." Day and night I watched by the couch of my sweet child, refusing to eat or sleep, suffering with and for her, and struggling to stifle the rebelliousness of spirit which I had so much censured in others: leaving her only when summoned to attend a funeral, and hastening back from other scenes of woe to drink the cup which was pressed to my own lips. It seems strange to me now that I never once asked that her life might be spared. But I had for months been praying that at whatever cost, my being might be fully consecrated to God: I would not shrink from it now. If the heartstrings must break, if the dregs of the cup drained by so many, were offered to me, that I might more fully know, and more successfully soothe the sufferings of other hearts; if, to draw my sluggish affections with quickened pace towards the pure heavens, it was needful that the idol of my heart be dashed to the ground, and broken before my eyes: I resolved to be dumb before my Maker. With preternatural calmness I watched the oncoming of death, when all others in the house were prostrate from fatigue or grief; noted carefully every harrowing phase of the awful struggle, until every look, groan, and writhing of anguish, seemed stamped on my soul; and when the spirit fled, closed the eyes of

my dead child in the last long sleep. My poor, dead lamb! The tears flow freely now, as I write of thee, as they would not flow then, when I stood in mute agony over thy lifeless form, and felt for the first time the awfulness of death! It seemed, in the dread stillness of that hour, as if I could almost hear the rustling of the angels' wings as they came to bear thee to thy heavenly home, my child! Yet it seemed to be so far, far away that they bore thee,—and earth's night seemed so chill and starless, that in my anguish I knew but one feeling—one wish: that I too might die, and follow thee speedily to that "happy land" of whose brightness and beauty thy childish lips had so often sung to me! I hope God has forgiven my unreasoning grief. After bowing over the dead body of my child, and my heart had struggled through a prayer of those "unutterable groanings," of which I never knew the meaning before, I rose, in a new strength, to seek to comfort and encourage my afflicted household. My poor wife, worn out with watchings, and crushed under the weight of this first bereavement, had yielded to a nervous prostration, and had sunk into utter helplessness. My children—but I cannot, even now, write calmly the dread history of this and succeeding days. Scarce had we returned from Edith's grave, when our youngest child—our bright-eyed CHARLIE, was smitten. Before a week had passed, there were three new-made graves in our family lot; EDITH, CHARLIE, and SUSAN —our eldest born—slept side by side, in the dust.

The baptism was complete—not only for me and mine, but for very many more. "Out of the depths" we emerged into a better life.—The church shook off the dust, and put on her beautiful garments; hundreds of sinners turned to the Lord. For eight weeks I have been preaching every night, and visiting every day, until, utterly worn out, I am compelled to rest, and take the leisure thus forced on me to make this record of the great things God has done for us, and of the strange way by which he has led us. About two hundred persons have been gathered into the fold. I would have sought for help from my brethren in the ministry in this great work; but partly owing to sickness and grief in my own family, and partly to our extreme poverty, I could not invite them to be guests in my house. My course on the Temperance question stripped me of half my support. We have learned to pray, in all its literalness, the heaven-taught prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread." Sickness and funeral expenses, have compelled us to dispose of everything of extra value we possessed, save a few sacred treasures that belonged to the dear departed ones. Our bread has been given us, and our water made sure; and this is about all we can say. In the midst of the wonderful triumphs of grace that have crowned our labors, I have been compelled to think

seriously—not for my own but for my family's sake—of seeking another location. But last night, in our deepest want, a surprise party, pleasanly arranged, came in on us with abundant supplies. Knowing my aversion to any ostentatious parade of kindness, they conveyed to us, in the quietest manner, provisions, clothing, and money, amounting in value to several hundred dollars. So I know the Lord wants me to stay here. I only pray that after all the wonderful experiences of the past, I may never doubt his care, nor shrink from duty when he calls.

[Here, for the present, we must part company with our excellent Eusebius, and close these papers. We have much more material on hand; but we only meant such sketches as would present life pictures of the more important features of pastoral work. We are happy to know that our venerable friend has gained the sympathy and admiration of many of the readers of the Harbinger. Some have even ventured to guess that they had once known him—but we are quite sure that in this they are mistaken. We are not at liberty, just now, to draw any farther aside the veil of secresy that hides his name and history. If what we have written shall lead any who are now young in the ministry into clearer or better views of their vocation, and inspire them with a just ambition to be "men of God" in deed and in truth, we shall hope for them, in their old age, as rich an experience, as precious treasures of memory, as pure and refined a taste, as mellow a life, the dear love and confidence of as many true Christian hearts, and as cheerful a hope of heaven, as crowned the closing years of Eusebius.] I. E.

WATER OR NO WATER;—WINE OR NO WINE.

That man is a restless, unsatisfied being, and therefore prone to 'many inventions,' the whole history of human kind proves. In religion this is as true as elsewhere. God may ordain in the plainest and most authoritative terms; the spirit of disobedient restlessness will not allow men to be satisfied with the divine order. If he cannot deny the explicit meaning of the law, his next shift is, in endless speculation, to seek for the right and the means of substitution. Are all the terms of the divine law or ordinance essential? or may not this or that in it be regarded as indifferent, and something be substituted, without violence to the spirit and benefits of the ordinance?—This is the thread that in tortuous windings runs throughout the whole history of religious speculations and errors. It is the thread that indicates the path of the spirit of a rebellious restlessness, such as tortured Eve when the tempter deceived her; that brought strange

fires upon God's altars, and offered the maimed, the halt, and the blind of the flocks, as sacrifices in His service. This disposition to meddle with and modify God's ordinances has nowhere risen to a fuller history than in Christian Baptism, as to its subject, form, and element. The daring, prurient, and often most absurd speculations, and consequent guilty aberrations on the subject of this ordinance, from the beginning of Christianity to this day, form a history most instructive to us, most humiliating, and full of solemn warning. It is not at all our purpose here to say anything upon the general question of Baptism, but briefly to call attention to the last of the three points in Baptism above enumerated,—its element. It is perhaps not generally known that the *material* of baptism has been a matter of much discussion and speculation. And yet it is so. Indeed this question is the counterpart, and we may say, the complement of the arguments that engendered the substitution of affusion and aspersion, for immersion. In the question of *form*, nobody at first, or for ages, dreamed of maintaining that in the divine ordinance anything else than immersion was instituted; and it is only the meagerest, lately-learned minority —the '*seri studiorum*' of Horace, that dare to defend the contrary; but the ever-ready wit of man, skilled in the logic of substitution, introduced and satisfied itself with modifications of the original terms and demands of the ordinance. So also the busy, prurient brain of dreamy, speculating theologians of the past, has filled a large chapter in church history with their absurd lucubrations on the question of changing the material element of baptism. It is almost incredible that sane men could ever have been guilty of such absurdities. But we must not be surprised at any thing. The discussion of this question covers centuries, engaged many of the most famous scholastic doctors and teachers even to the days of Luther. We shall in a few words touch upon the points of this controversy.

The earliest case of substitution recorded is that of a Jew, who, attacked in the desert with severe sickness, was baptized in *sand*.— Some place this incident in the reign of the emperor Marcus Aurelius. Nicephorus states, that the Bishop of Alexandria decided that this Jew might be regarded as lawfully baptized, if he had been washed off with water. The form of baptism of course was immersion.— Moschus, however, reports that he was afterwards baptized in the Jordan.

Another case occurred of baptism in *wine*. Pope Siricius, or as some say, Stephen II or III ordained, that "the Presbyter, who in a case of pressing necessity baptizes in wine, that the sick may not be endangered, for such an act is not to be held culpable. But the child, if it has been baptized in the Holy Trinity, is to be regarded

as truly baptized." The casuists have busied themselves very much to explain this case.

The scholastic doctors especially have exhausted their casuistic ingenuity in speculating on this question. In the question of the water of baptism, they distinguish between artificial, material, and common water; and then not satisfied with the word of the ordinance, discover in long series of speculative reasons, why water is to be used. Yet in spite of this accumulation of human reasons, others maintained the contrary.

Some maintained that *earth* could be used, because Christ was buried in the earth. Then the question was also raised, whether or not *air* could be used in the ordinance. It was argued that all the reasons urged for the use of water, such as universality, purity, translucency, &c., applied still more to air than to water. It was also discussed whether *fire* could be used.

Again, the question was raised whether *warm* water was allowable. Pelbartus objected, because the power of cold water to cool the passions, signified in baptism, would then be lost. Some, however, maintained the contrary, especially as the health and even the life of infants was endangered by baptizing in winter in cold water.

Is it allowable to baptize in *mead*, or *honey-water?* Many affirmed, others denied this. It was even argued by many of these doctors, that might be named, that *lye* was permissible in baptism. *Guido* says: "Baptism may be performed in lye, if water cannot be found, as lye is nothing else than water filtered through ashes"—and adds, that some doctors maintain the right of using even other elements, which we shall not cite here.

With some, it became a serious question whether any other water than that of the Jordan ought to be used. Some believed that it was permissible to baptize in *beer*. Claresius, however, made the important distinction that although no regular, strong, brewed beer ought to be used, yet that kind of beer, so weak that it is said, "If you pour it against the wall, nothing but water will run down," could be used. Whether *rose-water* could be used, was *doubted* by most of these learned doctors. "For," says J. Major, "a painted man is no real man, and rose-water is no real water." Yet it was a knotty question. As to whether the *broth* of *meat* or *fish* could be used, was a very intricate question for the doctors, and both sides had their advocates. St. Thomas, with others, maintained the affirmative. The *Angelic Doctor*, for so this greatest scholastic theologian and philosopher was called, argued, that "if a broth is so thick that it contains more of foreign dissolved bodies than of water, then the water can be skillfully extracted, and in such an *extract of broth* baptism can be performed as well

as in water." The *Summa Angelica*, however, demands that "the broth should contain neither salt nor butter."

Another delicate form of this controversy was, whether the water that flowed from the side of Jesus, was fit for baptism. The most affirmed, others denied; and the controversy ran thus: "If baptism was ordained in this water (in Christ), why should it not be suitable for baptism?" But others questioned whether the water that rested on the blood, the *fleuma*, was not unfit for baptism? The answer was, "The Evangelist does not say *fleuma*, but water, flowed from the wound."

It was also discussed whether snow, ice, hail, dew, frost, and other forms of moisture could be lawfully used. A still more intricate and attenuated form of this great scholastic question, which was warmly discussed, we shall pass over.

Among the reformers this question was also raised. Luther declares in his Table Talk, that in case of necessity, wine, milk, and beer could be used in baptism. Yet afterwards, in a sermon on baptism, he protested decidedly against the use of anything but water. Theodore Beza says: "If water is wanting, and baptism cannot be deferred, I could certainly baptize lawfully with some other liquid as well as with water." The reformers never accepted this view.

Such is a brief sketch of the controversy about the material element of baptism. Our readers will doubtless decide that such absurd speculations deserve nothing but contempt. And rightly so.—Yet, we beg leave to ask, is not the purity of the element of immersion, so clearly declared in the Holy Scriptures, a question worthy of attention? Surely it is! We carry this question farther, and ask, Is not the essential reality and purity of the divinely ordained element of any institution a matter of importance, and to be insisted on? You answer, Certainly;—but who doubts this, or who is violating the law of God in this respect? We answer, very many!

We have taken our readers through the details of the above controversy with a special design. We now intend to make the application. First, is the element of *wine* in the Lord's Supper of less consequence than the element of water in baptism? We all have but one answer to this. But how does the matter stand in actual practice? Does not almost every man know that we are weekly using in the ordinance of Christ an element that is not wine, but a base compound, scarcely—in most cases not at all—deserving the name even of adulteration? It is well known that all these foreign wines sold in the liquor stores and shops, are pure manufactures, mostly originating in our country, having generally not a particle of real wine in them. Does not every reader of the papers know, that *receipts* for

making all kinds of foreign wine, by compoundings of nostrums, often very vile and injurious, are regularly advertised, and systematically used by all liquor dealers in our land? Is anybody ignorant of the notorious fact, that the liquors bought in the shops are all base cheats? We cannot say that these amazing frauds on the public have 'deceived the very elect!' The elect have been misled, but not deceived. We all fully understand the fraud. We know, moreover, that the making,—and shall we not also say the vending?—of these miserable compounds, is itself a great immorality. It is certainly a most shameful traffic! And how sad it is to know that the Christian community lend their countenance to it, by buying and using the wretched stuff in the holy communion! It has been long regarded as a great nuisance in our midst—this use of worse than adulterations in the holy ordinance of Christ. We dare not utter what we think on this subject. We cannot but feel deeply mortified to see generally over the land, Sunday after Sunday, year after year, this most reprehensible patience, or rather careless negligence, on the part of a Christian people, that leads them to use these compounds when they know better things. And it is not for the want of pure wine. An abundance of that can be procured everywhere, if people will but take a little trouble. Some of the above scholastic speculations are endurable, compared with this pollution and degradation of the divine ordinance!

And how does the question stand especially with us, who are earnestly pleading for a primitive, unadulterated Christianity?—who allow in the commands of Christ no modifications by human caprice? Is it less criminal to substitute a base compound, the very character of which we know nothing of, for the juice of the grape used and ordained by our blessed Lord on that night of sorrows, and *bless* it and partake of it, than to offer substitutes in matter, form, or purpose, in this or any other divine ordinance? If this can be allowed, why be tenacious about other things? It is indeed grievous to witness, as we have often witnessed, a whole congregation tortured and set a coughing by the base and injurious drugs they are knowingly and helplessly made to take, in the solemn and sacred ordinance. It is a weekly recurring grave offense to the patience and consciences of many.—How long shall this violation of a divine law, for which there is no excuse, be yet endured?

C. L. L.

Be not thou envious against evil men, neither desire to be with them; for their heart studieth destruction, and their lips talk of mischief.—Prov.

PASTORS AND TEACHERS.

After all that has been said and written on the above terms, it seems there is yet a good deal of confusion in the minds of many, concerning them. This arises doubtless from failing to distinguish between an officer of a church, and the several relations in which, as such, he stands, and under which he may be contemplated. The Scriptures authorize but three classes of officers in the organization of the Christian church after the days of the apostles. These are, (1) Presbyters or Elders; (2) Deacons; (3) Evangelists. But some will ask, What is your warrant for pastors? I answer, the same that we have for elders, for a *pastor* is an elder contemplated in the relation of as *hepherd* to a *flock*. The office is the same, but the specific work of watching and feeding the flock, is indicated in the term pastor.

It is evident that the Scriptures adopt this method of designating officers of the same degree and rank;—and for the reason, that the duties which they have to perform are not only various, but often too onerous for one person to perform. They are therefore distributed—each one of the body taking perhaps some special work, and being designated by a name which specifically indicates it. Was the office contemplated with reference to the seniority of its rank, then the officers were called elders or presbyters; was it with reference to the general duties of oversight, then they were called overseers or bishops; was it with reference to the special labor in word and doctrine, then they were called teachers; was it with reference to the spiritual nurture and care of the flock, then they were called pastors. Now a man may be an elder, and not a teacher or pastor, in the special sense of these words; but he cannot be *officially* a pastor or teacher without being an elder. The term elder gives the rank of the office, and applies to all of the class or body; but the term pastor expresses a particular member of the body, whose services as an elder are peculiarly devoted to the business of "taking heed to the flock over which the Holy Spirit has made them (i. e. the body of officers of which he was one) overseers, to feed the church of God which he had purchased with his own blood."*

We lay down these, as established propositions, which we need not now pause to prove. Admitting them to be true, then it follows that in every complete eldership there must be a pastor. Every elder need not be a pastor, though he may be. Indeed, some men possess the rare combination of faculties which enables them to rule well, labor in word and doctrine, exhort, reprove, confute, and at the same

* Acts 20. 28.

time discharge the more affectionate and tender pastoral work of comforting the feeble-minded and supporting the weak, showing patience towards all. Happy the church that is blessed with such a man! but as a general rule, we find it necessary to look out for one specially fitted for this work, and to associate him with other elders, who are qualified, without him, to discharge most of the duties of their office, and with him, thoroughly furnished for them all.

Now suppose the strictly pastoral labor needed in a particular congregation does not require all the time and energies of a pastor, and that, moreover, the congregation is not able to pay him for his undivided services, what shall hinder him from rendering similar service, for the remainder of his time, to some other neighboring congregation, that may call him to their aid? Cannot a shepherd watch over and feed two small congregations quite as well as, or better sometimes than, he can one large one? And if so, upon what principle of policy or rule of authority can we forbid him? Clearly none.

The question is sometimes asked, What is the authority of a pastor in a congregation? We answer, that of an elder, a co-ordinate of the other bishops. Only this and nothing more. It is a vain and unscriptural assumption for such an one to claim any superiority in official rank or authority. Indeed, when called, as in most cases, simply with a reference to the special work of a pastor, he should be very modest in the extent of his participation or officiousness in any other duty of the eldership; and this, not because he is not equal, in rank, with the rest, but because of the will of his brethren of the congregation, who have called him only perhaps to a special work. Still, if he have gifts for other duties of his office as well, and occasion call for their exercise, let him use them for the glory of God and the good of the church.

For the most part, pastors are also teachers, and it is very natural for them to assume undue precedence in the affairs of the church.—So far as they act strictly as delegated representatives of their co ordinate elders, this is right enough. It should always depend, however, upon the consent and appointment of the eldership—never be assumed or claimed as matter of prerogative. It is important to guard this point—especially as the lesson of history admonishes us that this very claim has been the cunning device by which clerical hierarchies have justified their arrogant assumptions of power, and succeeded in establishing their oppressive lordship over the heritage of God.

One who is called by a congregation to share in its oversight, chiefly if not entirely because of his gifts as a teacher and pastor, ought to enter upon these duties with a modest reluctance to assume authority

or conspicuity in any other form of duty. Indeed, except under the tyrannical systems of priestcraft, it is often calculated to injure the power of a pastor, should he take a prominent and leading part in the matters of discipline, and government generally, which constitute sometimes so disagreeable a part of the duties of the eldership. The subjects of discipline will think hard of those who impose it, and these therefore are generally, in good measure, cut off from that affectionate confidence which is so necessary to successful spiritual influence and power. But if he who is specially devoted to the labors of the pastor, is true to his calling, he will, as a general rule, though he is one of the elders, avoid this prejudice, and stand as a sort of mediator between the just and necessary though painful discipline of the church, and the unfortunate subject of it.

It is thought by some, that there are symptoms of clerical arrogance showing themselves to an alarming degree among some of our public ministers. That there may be sporadic cases, is no doubt true. To doubt this, would be to ignore the pride and tyranny of human nature, and to claim for the ministers of the gospel among us, what has never been found true of any body of men in any age of the world,—that is, that they are all free from ambition and all taint of human selfishness. But that there is any reason to suppose that there is any combination of influence, planning by settled agreement and concurrent action the establishment, upon principle, of such a departure from the ancient order of things, we do not for a moment believe. There was a Judas among the apostles, but that did not vitiate the apostolic office; there are hypocrites brought to baptism under the best of preaching, but that is no reason for abolishing preaching; and there will be arrogant, presumptuous and selfish men among our pastors, but that will not justify us in doing away with the office. It is wrong to judge anything—a work of art, of literature, or of legislation—by its defects. We should rather try it by its positive virtues. The course of instruction, or the influence of a college, is not to be condemned, because out of a hundred eminently sound and useful men, it may turn out one who is erratic and unsound. Such a principle would condemn every preacher in the land, for the hypocrisy and carnality of many that they baptize, and warrant us in charging the Great Teacher himself with the treachery of Judas. But no sensible and fair man will reason so. It is only where there is a wish to make out the case, or the mind is darkened by infidel forebodings concerning the power and permanence of divine institutions, that men can be so misguided and unwise. Let us watch the artful movements of clerical ambition, as we would guard the palladium of our religious liberty, but do not let us, in blind infidelity of the unsleeping providence

that ever watches over the fortunes of the church, lay impious hands upon any divine arrangement, and abolish it, because, forsooth, we see in it the *possibility* of danger. This were to doubt the divine wisdom, and to substitute for His appointments, which are all the decrees of unerring knowledge, the blind expedients of our own feeble and fallible intellects. If the Scriptures say there should be pastors and teachers, let us have them, and if experience demonstrates that they are likely to "lord it over God's heritage," let us watch them, and prevent them. In attempting to root out the tares, do not let us destroy the wheat. W. K. P.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC.

Dear Brother Hayden:—There is no brother with whom I could hope to have a more amicable interchange of thought upon any disputed question, than with yourself. I am glad, therefore, that you have undertaken to test the soundness of my arguments against instrumental music in Christian worship. Like you, I wish to "defend the truth by *truth*;" and I make it a rule never knowingly to advance an unsound argument in the discussion of any question. Let my arguments, then, be tested severely; and let it be made perfectly clear whether the use of instruments in worship is condemned or not by the word of God.

I am pleased with the directness and compactness of your article, and especially with the fact that you join issue on the one argument to which I called especial attention. If that argument is valid, the question is settled with all who are willing to be governed by the word of God. To test its merits will give us, what every seeker of the truth desires, a narrow field of controversy, and bring us into close quarters. I will notice your objections *seriatim*.

1. You first object to my argument, because it is founded on the *silence* of the Scriptures, and state that this looks "*suspicious*." Why should it look suspicious? Is not the silence of the Scriptures the limit which God himself has assigned to the expression of his will? Let us understand each other and our subject a little better on this point.

There are some things which mere human testimony and experience may prove to be true, or to be proper. Upon these, the silence of the scriptures could have no bearing whatever. The question which you adduce, as to when and by whom the canon of the Old Testament was formed, is one of this class. There are other things which cannot be shown to be right, except by an expression of the will of God. To this class belong all acts of worship, and all religious ordinances.

No man could know that prayer, or singing, or immersion, or the Lord's Supper, or preaching, is acceptable to God, were it not for precepts or examples in the word of God. Where, therefore, anything belonging to this class of subjects, is introduced by men, the the silence of the scriptures in reference to it, is a sufficient ground for its condemnation. The Bible-loving Brother Hayden will not deny this.

Now the proposition on which my argument was based was limited to *acts of worship*. It was this: "We cannot, by any possibility, know that a certain element of worship is acceptable to God in the Christian dispensation, when the scriptures which speak of that dispensation are silent in reference to it. To introduce any such element is unscriptural and presumptuous. It is will-worship, if any such thing as will-worship can exist." I feel sure that you are far from denying either of these propositions. But instrumental music in public worship, is an element of that worship, declared to be so by the only people ever authorized to employ it. For David says "*Praise* him with the sound of the trumpet; *praise* him with the psaltery and harp; *praise* him with the timbrel and dance; *praise* him with stringed instruments and organs." (Ps. 150.) The scriptures, however, which speak of the acts of worship under the Christian dispensation are silent in reference to this element; they furnish no authority for it; therefore it is *will-worship* to make use of it.

While upon this point, I will call your attention again to a statement in my first article, which furnishes the readiest method of refuting my argument, if such refutation is possible. It is this: "If any man can mention an act or an element of worship, known to be now acceptable to God, but not authorized by the New Testament, he will prove this argument to be invalid." Can you, Bro. Hayden, mention such an act of worship?

2. You object to my reason for "the disuse of *incense, lamps, and priestly robes*"; but in giving what you style "the New Testament reason for their disuse," you demolish instrumental music as effectually as my own argument would have done. You say, "These, and other, and *all parts* of the Jewish economy passed into disuse, because that institution "decayed, waxed old, and was ready to vanish away." Now the use of instruments in worship was certainly *one* part of that economy. When, therefore, "*all parts* of that economy passed into disuse," what became of instrumental music? The blows of your own logic have demolished it. The poor thing is certainly in a bad way, when those who strike in its defense cannot avoid knocking it in the head.

But your statement that "all parts of that economy passed into dis-

use," needs some qualifications. By virtue of its abrogation, all parts of it would, of necessity, have passed into disuse, had not some of them, such as prayer, praise, teaching, giving, and some others, been perpetuated by express divine athority. All not thus perpetuated did pass into disuse, and among them the employment of musical instruments in worship.

I fear, Bro. Hayden, that many of our preachers have forgotten, and still more of of them have never learned, the exact relation of the three great dispensations to one another. It was formerly a leading theme among our preachers and writers; it has more recently been much neglected. I would recommend to every preacher, both young and old, a reperusal of the essays in the old Christian Baptist, on this subject.

3. Your third objection is equally ruinous to instrumental music with the second. In attempting to put my argument into a syllogistic form, you state the major premise as follows: "Practices ordained in the law of Moses, on which the New Testament is silent, are condemned by the Holy Spirit." You then say, "Instrumental music is not of that category." You deny that it was either "ordained in the law," or "incorporated into the ancient institution, so as to bring it under the class of reasoning here discussed." Now if this is true, it follows that instrumental music in worship never was divinely authorized even among the Jews; that it was will-worship with them; and that with us it is a wicked imitation of a Jewish corruption. Surely, Bro. Hayden, yours is a two edged sword, and its back strokes are the most fatal.

But the use of instrumental music in worship was not an unauthorized innovation among the Jews. Though not "ordained in the law," it was introduced by the inspired Psalmist, and received the subsequent sanction of other inspired men. It was, therefore, "incorporated into the ancient institution, so as to bring it under" the force of my reasoning, though not as you represent that reasoning. In your syllogistic representation, you confine the argument to what was "ordained in the law," and thus get a chance to slip instrumental music out of the way; but in this you unintentionally misrepresent my argument. My statement, from which you formed your major premise, was really this,—"that all the acts of Jewish worship were appointed by *divine authority*;" not, that they were "ordained in the *law*." You now see to what expression of divine authority I refer instrumental music.

There was really no necessity for your throwing my argument into the form of a syllogism, for it had already assumed that form with sufficient accuracy for the application of the tests of logic. I will

now re-produce it, and submit it anew to your inspection. The premises and conclusion may all be stated in my original words as follows:

"The fact that any part of the Jewish worship was discontinued by those who organized the Christian church, is a direct condemnation of it by the spirit of God, as unsuited to the new institution."

This is the major proposition. Will you deny it, Bro. Hayden? Please to scan it carefully, and use upon it, with your utmost skill, that "keen dissecting knife" for which Bro. Pendleton so justly gives you credit; then say, whether it is true or false. I am much mistaken if you do not pronounce it true, and see in it the true ground on which to combat more than one of the corruptions of Romanism and sectarianism.

My minor proposition was this: "The use of instrumental music is an element of Jewish worship which was thus discontinued." Is there any doubt about this? No one denies that it was an element of Jewish worship, or that it was "discontinued by those who organized the Christian church." The premises, then, are true beyond controversy. Let us see the conclusion:

"Therefore, the use of instrumental music in worship is condemned by the spirit of God, as unsuited to the new institution.

Now, Bro. Hayden, if this argument is valid, I again repeat, that every man who bows to the authority of God's word, must oppose the use of instrumental music in the church. If it contains any fallacy, please to point it out; for I declare to you, I am unable to see it.

Feb., 1865. J. W. McGarvey.

REVISION OF LUTHER'S TRANSLATION.

A European German journal announces, that the Committee of the Wirtemberg Bible Society has come to the conviction, that a thorough revision of Luther's translation of the Bible has become a necessity. The Committee supports its determination on the fact that the German language, during the centuries that have elapsed since Luther accomplished his great work, has undergone such changes, that his translation has become to a large extent unintelligible to the younger generation. This thorough renovation is already begun. In this new work Luther's vigor of expression is to be retained, but at the same time full satisfaction is to be rendered to the progress the German language has made. The work, when finished, is to appear in the best style of typographical execution.

So the great impulse to do justice to the Word of God, is manifesting itself everywhere. Luther's Bible is to the German Nation all that the Common Version is to the English; yet the light of knowl-

edge, an unfettered evangelical freedom, and above all, an earnest conscientious regard for the truth of God and the spiritual wants of men, are leading the children of Luther, who venerate his name, to honor his work by doing for this generation what he did for his. What is becoming of the objections to a revision or new translation, for the English world? And what will the American Bible Societies do with reference to this forthcoming new German translation *by authority?* Do all arguments for revising centuries-old versions fail, and fail only, in the English, and especially in the American-English, world? We shall see. C. L. L.

MUSIC IN CHURCHES.

Giacomo Meyerbeer, who died last year in Paris, was one of the greatest composers and pianists of our day. Like Mendelsohn and other famous masters of music, he was a Jew. Dr. Ludwig Frankl once requested him to furnish a musical composition for the consecration of a new Synagogue in Vienna. His reply is worthy of consideration, as it is the testimony of one whose soul was filled with the highest harmonies; and who would often, forgetful of all else, pass whole nights alone, lost in the sublime melodies that his magic hands drew forth from the instrument, symphonious with the music that swept through his spirit. "Surely," said he to his friend, "you would not think of introducing an organ into the synagogue? This is a purely Christian instrument. And then, I regard it as a most praiseworthy act on my part, that in perfect agreement with Mendelsohn, I introduced only a singing choir in the Protestant Dome (chief church) in Berlin. Worshipping man should speak to his God without any artistic medium. This is the notion of the Jews since the destruction of the temple, and has thus become a habit for nearly two thousand years. We must introduce no innovation. But if absolutely some other music must be had, then, according to my opinion, it ought to come from trumpets and flutes, as it was heard in the temple of Solomon. But the human voice has the greatest power to move the soul." C. L. L.

FOREIGN RELIGIOUS NEWS.

Greece.—An article in the new constitution declares:

"The orthodox eastern church of Christ is the established religion of Greece. Every other religion is tolerated, and may be exercised under the laws. But proselyting and every interference with the established religion is forbidden." This of course will put an end to any missionary operations in that country.

GERMANY.—The Methodist Missionaries in Germany have hitherto professedly confined themselves to the work of laboring for conversion and spiritual revival within the established Protestant churches, without aiming to establish separate organizations. The official journal, however, of the consistory of Wirtemberg publishes an order relative to the encroachments of the Methodists upon the established church. This order charges the Methodist missionaries with a breach of faith, since they have begun to attend to the communion in their assemblies, which they heretofore promised not to do. It further declares that all taking part in such communion shall be regarded and treated as seceded from the established church. Finally, the church authorities over the kingdom are ordered to keep a stricter watch over the conduct of the Methodists in their various districts, and report to the higher authorities. Whatever of all this may be true of the Methodists in Wirtemberg, the above order is a sad proof of the darkness yet resting on the subject of religious freedom, even in this enlightened and liberal part of Germany.

In *Hamburg* rationalism reveals itself in the following forms. At the Lutheran church of St. Catharine the pastor baptizes infants "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the *Christian* Spirit," —by the latter he means the spirit of liberal Christian freedom and progress. Another Lutheran minister of the same church in that city, a Dr. Krause, has published a sermon lately delivered by him on the theme:—"The little that we know of the external history of our Lord from the Holy Scripture." The divisions of this sermon are: "1, Of his youth almost nothing; 2, Of his manhood but scattered notices; and 3, Of his death only what has been super-naturalized by the extravagance of his friends."

FRANCE.—Renan's perversion of the Life of Jesus has excited even the Catholics to scatter the gospel among the people. The Abbe Crampon has made and published a new translation of the four gospels. That able and popular paper, the *Journal des Debats*, last year expressed itself in the following noble words: "Of all the replies that Renan's *Life of Jesus* has called forth, according to our opinion the best is the one which the Abbe Crampon has given by publishing a new translation of the four gospels. Here lies the whole controversy. We cannot comprehend what arguments can convince those, who, when they read the sacred text, can perceive nothing divine.—Further, we can much less conceive how those who find the divine idea expressed in every line of the evangelical narration, can allow themselves to be staggered in their faith by these objections of a criticism that changes with every century. If the Divine Wisdom desir-

ed to have intercourse with us mortals, in mortal form, was it not necessary to speak, act, and live as Christ spoke, acted, and lived? Read the four evangelists with a pure, impartial mind, and solve the problem for yourself. In these everything hangs together. In vain would it be to attempt to separate the morality from the history. The morality of the gospel is nothing, if it is not that of the sacrifice of the cross; and the morality of the cross is nothing but a heroic chimera, if it is not based, as a foundation, upon a divine life and a divine death in him that preaches this morality. The sufferings of Christ alone could put the seal upon his doctrine, and teach us to understand its mysterious sublimity. All is wonderful and all appears natural in the life and the teachings of Christ. His wonders, his work, his death form so harmonious a whole, that we know not whether to marvel more at the wonder or the simplicity of it." The venerable and learned Guizot, who is a Protestant, has also entered the arena in defense of the Bible against its assailants.

The Pope's late *Encyclical*, dated Dec. 8th., for its lofty assumption, its stupid intolerance and blindness, is worthy of the dark ages. The journal just quoted, the *Debats*, says of it:

"The Holy Father does not confine himself to pointing out and condemning the errors which are contrary to the truths of the Catholic faith, and to hurling an anathema against materialism, pantheism and rationalism; he departs from the sanctuary and the limits which are naturally assigned to his spiritual jurisdiction to extend his influence and authority on a ground which is not his domain—on the interests of civil and political order. The world must without doubt bear in mind that we are not now in the eleventh century, and that no one can any longer dare to go so far as to claim, as in the time of Gregory VII, the right of deposing kings and releasing subjects from their oath of fidelity, but the pretension is clearly shown of interfering in the relations between sovereigns and their subjects, of domineering over one and the other, and of enacting the arbitrator between governments and their people."

The *Constitutionnel* says:—"The evident intention of Rome is to break with all the principles upon which modern society reposes." It is a good thing that the teeth of the old beast that raged in former days, are broken, or woe would be to us! Yet the impotent monster roars loudly from his lair in Rome.

NEW TESTAMENT REVISED,

We have been kindly favored with this work of the American Bible Union. Although it comes from the hands of the Final Committee, it is the purpose of the Society to have it made still more perfect, by every aid that they can command. Bro. Buckbee, Asst. Treasurer, says:

"While we believe this is a great improvement on the common version, we do not assume that it is perfect. Candid criticism we want. We are determined

to have the work perfect, as men can make it. If we have not hit the mark the first time, we shall not hesitate to work on.

"The advance orders for the Testament have not yet been filled. One press, all the time, and part of the time two presses, have been running for five weeks.

"So numerous are the calls for distribution among the soldiers, seamen, immigrants, and freedmen, that our hearts sink within us at our inability to answer half of them. Much good has been done by the distribution; and we feel compelled to ask the brethren for special contributions for this work."

We lay before our readers the appeal made by the Bible Union in this behalf:

"The Bible Union has distributed many thousands of copies of its Soldiers' Edition among the sick, the wounded, and the dying. Many rejoice in the hope of pardon communicated through these precious books.

"The completion of the New Testament falls upon a time of special providential openings, and the calls for grants of various editions to the soldiers, the sailors, and the freedmen, can not be met without a large and prompt supply of means to pay the expense.

"More than one hundred thousand copies could now be judiciously distributed, through chaplains and others, whose letters are calling earnestly for help.

"The freedmen have a very special claim upon us for the gospel. Just emerging from the degradation of their former ignorance and bondage, they rapidly learn to read; and they prize the Bible above all other books. They crave the promises of Jesus. They want to read his word for themselves.

"The Bible Union makes its appeal to the people of God for aid, in order that no applicant need be denied.

"We appeal to the mother, whose son is in the army or navy, and for whom her prayers are ascending to God.

"We appeal to the sister, whose cherished brother is far away on the battle-field.

"We appeal to the father for his co-operation in this great work.

"We appeal to the Sabbath-school. Will not the superintendent and teachers help us? We ask you who are superintendents to read our request before your schools, and take up a collection.

"We appeal to the churches especially, and beg that collections be taken up and sent at once to the Bible Union."

We will not enter here into any examination of the merits of this revision, as we intend, when time and space allow, to give it the consideration which, as the result of a great movement, it deserves. W. K. P.

GOOD WORDS FROM OUR CORRESPONDENTS.

Bro. Pendleton:—Through your most excellent monthly, I would report to the brethren the success of the cause in our State. Bro. C. G. Bartholomew reports the labors of Bro. B. C. Sherman in the 9th district, resulting in 22 additions to the church—16 by baptism. He also reports the labors of Bros. J. Z. Taylor and B. Franklin at Rockville, resulting in 60 additions by baptism. Bro. M. Smith, in Clark, Floyd and Orange counties, has received 11 into the church, all by baptism. Bros. Leonard and Winter have had 40 additions at Americus. Bro. W. S. Patterson has labored with great success in the 2nd district, which earnest labors have resulted in 68 additions—49 by baptism. The work of our Mission is progressing gloriously, and we hope to enlist all the talent of our brotherhood in the good work. The prospects of the N. W. Christian University are becoming very good. Bro. J. M. Henry, of Dayton, is traveling, preaching the gospel and soliciting funds for the college. Pray for us, brethren, that the truth may run, and prevail over all opposition.

Indianapolis, Ind. R. L. Howe, Cor. Sec. I. C. M. S.

MARTINSBURG, Knox co., O., Jan. 28, 1865.

BRO. PENDLETON:—Bro. Moody and myself have just closed a meeting of two weeks with the Bladensburg congregation (4 miles east of this), resulting in 29 immersions and 1 restored. These and 4 at a meeting two weeks previous with the Dennis congregation, and those reported in my last, make 72 who have been immersed during the last two months within the bounds of three congregations. At our last meeting, the ice cut in order to immerse, was one foot thick; the meeting was held during the coldest weather we have experienced this winter.

D. G. MITCHELL.

COLUMBUS, KY., Jan. 18, 1865.

BRO. PENDLETON:—I have just closed a meeting at Republican, Adair co.—Result—church re-organized and 12 accessions—11 by immersion, 1 by commendation—making 29 during the last five weeks. Fraternally,

M. P. BAILEY.

Bro. T. S. Linsley, of Jackson co., Te., writes us that "the spirit of war drew many disciples in his region, off into the weak and beggarly elements of the world. The congregation at Philomath, of which he is a member, is the only one in the county that assembles regularly. A majority of the preachers of that county imbibed, in the beginning of a political strife, the spirit of war, and taught its justification among Christians; but many of them have seen the error of their way, and turned from it."

Our venerable Bro. Rice informs us that Elders Palmer and White are preaching in his county (Calloway, Mo.), and that a goodly number are bowing to the Lord.

Bro. G. W. T. reports 8 immersions, recently, at Pittstown, N. Y., under the labors of Bro. A. B. Chamberlain, pastor of the church.

Bro. S. B. Teagarden reports 5 additions at Deerfield, O., as the result of a ten days' meeting, closing on the 16th Jan.

OBITUARIES.

Died, on Wednesday, Dec. 28th, 1864, at his residence in New Lisbon, O., Philip Prouse, in the 77th year of his age.

Father Prouse was one of the fathers in Israel. He was among the first that embraced the ancient gospel, under the preaching of Walter Scott, at the beginning of the reformation, which we believe had its first beginning in this place some 38 years ago. He lived a faithful and devoted Christian from that time until his death, and though the messenger came to him in health, and came suddenly, he found him ready and prepared to go. Thus the ripe sheaves are gathered home, and we are left with nothing but their name and example. May we also be ready when the summons comes.

New Lisbon, O., Jan. 20th, 1865. P. GALLEY.

Died, at Winchester, Ky., on the 21st Oct., 1864, in the 73rd year of her age, our aged and venerable mother Poston. She was for many years a member of the Baptist church, and adorned her profession of Christ with a life of steady faith and piety. Honored by her friends, esteemed by her Christian brethren, and tenderly loved by her children, she has passed from earth to her reward in heaven.

P.

Died, at Winchester, Ky., on Saturday, Jan. 14th, 1865, of Scarlet Fever, Jennie Carr, daughter of James A. and Anna B. Meng—about two years and eight months old. While we mourn, we rejoice in the assurance that the dear little one, who has so suddenly left us, has gone to the throne of God, where she will forever bask in the sunshine of her Savior's presence. J. A. C.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 36.] BETHANY, W. V., *MARCH*, 1865. [No. III.

DISCOURSE,

DELIVERED AT BETHANY, DEC. 25TH, 1864, BY DR. R. RICHARDSON.

"This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son, hath life: and he that hath not the Son, hath not life."—1 JNO. v. 11, 12.

Life is the most excellent of things. Its possession is the tenure by which every thing else is possessed. Even in its lowest form, it seems most precious, and the little plant, almost separated from the soil, clings by a single fiber, and struggles to maintain or re-establish the relations by which its existence may be perpetuated. The animal, endowed with sensation and voluntary motion, shrinks with instinctive horror and flies from everything that threatens to destroy its life. Even man himself, rational and enlightened, is willing to undergo the most painful surgical operations to prolong, for a few short years, his fleeting life; and will often welcome certain diseases, with all their exquisite and protracted sufferings, because their presence is supposed to be favorable to longevity.

But the present animal life that man possesses, is most transitory. It is compared by James to "a vapor which appears for a little time, and then vanishes away." "Behold," says David, "thou hast made my days as a handbreadth, and mine age is as nothing before thee."—"Remember how short my time is; wherefore hast thou made all men in vain?" Short as this life is, however, it is never to be renewed. Night may shroud in funereal robes of darkness the once gay and busy earth, but dewy morn, "with charm of earliest birds," shall day by day restore its life and beauty. In the progress

of the months, in vain does brown Autumn clothe the earth with *russet*. In vain do the chill blasts of Winter sweep in triumph over the ruins of the perished year. The genial Spring shall again revisit the earth, and clothe in living green its fields and forests, and deck its hills and vales with painted flowers. But it is not so with man.—Each day but shortens our brief span of life. And even amidst the genial hours when "Spring flowers, spring birds, spring breezes," are "felt and heard and seen," when "Light, trembling transport seizes the heart, with sighs between,"—even while vernal breezes fan us, we grow old; and, though surrounded by Spring's blooming flowers and verdant fields, the hoary head continues to whiten in the winter of age, and its frosts gather around the heart.

This animal life, nevertheless, however short and fleeting, is important to us, and, as we have said, most dearly cherished. It has been said, "All that a man has will he give for his life," and this in a certain sense is true; but only in such a low and groveling view of man, as Satan and his children entertain. In a higher and truer account of human nature, we find many things dearer to man than life—as honor, friendship, and love in all its forms. A Job, a Regulus, an innumerable army of martyrs, attest how much dearer than life are principles of right and faith and truth—how much more precious the honor, the integrity, the purity,—in a word, the *life* of the soul, than the life of the body. Even amidst the darkness of heathenism, even in its state of separation from God, the soul has recognized its higher and imperishable nature, and has preferred its hopes and interests to those of that fleeting animal life with which it finds itself associated. Hence the desire for fame—the desire to live in the works of mind to future ages, from the consciousness that the body will perish, but that works of mind, like the mind itself, are imperishable.

Where now are the charms of Cleopatra, or the blooming youth of Hero? Where the beauty of Helen, or the wifely graces of Andromache? Where the strength of Ajax—the swiftness of Achilles—the prowess of Diomede? Where is he who gave to these traditions or imaginings the boon of immortality? His very birthplace is unknown. His personal history is vainly sought. He is to us but a myth—a mere name—HOMER—five letters, like five fingers holding forth from amidst the darkness of antiquity, an Iliad and an Odyssey. That name represents to us no material form. It stands for no written character nor printed volume. It is the name of the soul—the genius that gave to these creations their form and beauty.

So may we contemplate the *Venus de Medici*, that masterpiece of Grecian art. We admire not the material of which it is composed. This is no better than the rude blocks which yet lie in the quarries

of Pentelicus. But we are fascinated by that grace of form and feature, that exquisite proportion, that elegance of contour—these indescribable charms that seem to animate the lifeless marble. Or, rather, we admire in these the genius of the author—the beauty of the conception—nay the beauty of the SOUL that thus embodied its bright ideal. On the base there is this inscription: *Cleomenes, the Athenian, son of Apollodorus*—the name of one whose personal history is lost—of an individual unknown; or rather, it is the name of a SOUL *known*, evermore revealing itself through the succession of ages.

Man is thus presented to us as possessed of two natures—a body and a soul—a material frame and an immortal spirit. The body, in an immediate sense, we derive from parents—the spirit is derived from God. Hence we are said to have "fathers of our flesh," but it is God who is the "Father of spirits." And as in body we bear a likeness to our parents, so is the soul in the image of God. As the living plant can proceed alone from a living plant, and this, in like manner, from a parent that preceded: so men proceed from parents, and these from others, and thence are traced again in regular antecedence to the original pair, who were created upright and in the enjoyment of fellowship and life with God. But these, having sinned, and incurred the penalty of death, were, accordingly, separated from that divine communion and favor which constituted the life of the soul. For all life rests in certain relations, as of the plant to the earth and air—of the body to its food and functions of nutrition—of the soul to the favor and spiritual fellowship of God. To be cut off from any of these, is death—vegetable—natural—spiritual. Each, indeed, thus separated, may possess *existence*, and we may accordingly have dead plants, dead bodies and dead souls. But existence is not life, since everything exists, the lifeless equally with the living, and the lifeless *for* the living. Death can never be predicated of anything that has mere existence. It is annihilation that is the opposite of existence, as death contrasts with life. Death is separation. It is sin that is the cause of death to us, since it is sin that separates man from God. The sin of our first parents placed them in a state of separation and alienation from God, and as all their descendants are born in this state, they are necessarily participants in all that infinite wisdom has associated with it. Thus it is that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin: and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."*

* Rom. v. 12. Angels, too, have sinned and fallen, but their case presents quite a contrast to that of man. Created independently, and not produced by descent from a common stock, *a part* of the angels might fall without in any way implicating the rest. In the case of men, this was impossible, all being considered as necessarily included in their federative head.

Nevertheless, it has pleased God, in the plenitude of his wisdom and mercy, to provide a means by which the human soul may be delivered from its state of alienation and death, and be restored, through a divine palingenesia, to the favor and fellowship of the Creator.—In order to accomplish this in entire harmony with his own glorious attributes and the nature and condition of the human soul, he has provided a second Adam, through whom life may be restored to men. This all-sufficient Savior, as the sacrificial Lamb of God, has taken away the sin of the world, and rendered it possible for God to be just in justifying the ungodly. "Through death" he has "destroyed him that had the power of death," and has "brought life and immortality to light." He is constituted the Prophet—the Priest—the King of men—a new and living head for the human family, to impart life to all who come to him. Hence, as in our text, the entire meaning of the Divine procedure, the sum and substance of the record, is, "that God has given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." It hence follows that "he that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life." For as no one can exist bodily except by descent from the first Adam, so no one can live spiritually unless by union with the second Adam. And just as inevitably as those connected with the former inherit death, so certainly do those united to the latter, partake of life. "For if," as elsewhere expressed in Holy Scripture, "by one man's offense, death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ." Rom. vi. 17.

He, then, "that hath the Son, hath life," and if it be desired to know what it is to have the Son, the Scriptures will amply explain. To have the Son, is to have an interest in the atonement he has offered. It is to be justified by faith and to have peace with God. It is to have accepted Christ as our only Prophet, Priest and King—as our wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. It is, in the obedience of the gospel, to have been "buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." It is, in brief, to have Christ formed in us the hope of glory, and through him to have been made alive to God, to have been sealed with the Holy Spirit, and re-united to the fountain of eternal life and blessedness.

The mighty change that is thus wrought in regard to the state, the character and the destiny of man, is appropriately termed, in Scripture, *a new creation*. He that is in Christ is a new creature. "We are his workmanship," says Paul to the Ephesians, "created in Christ Jesus unto good works." The regenerated or "new man" is,

"after God, created in righteousness and true holiness." Regarded in this point of view, the Scripture is no less explicit in indicating the means through which we attain to the enjoyment of the life that is in Christ. As, in the beginning, all things were created by the Word of God, so, in order to the new creation, the Word was made flesh and dwelt among men. As, at first, there could be no life without light, and the first effect of the Word of God was to produce light, so now, Christ is first revealed as the "Light of the world." He, in whom was life, in order to the impartation of that life, became first the "Light of men"; and all were invited to come to him in order to receive the "Light of Life." For the darkened human soul must first be illuminated by the knowledge of God. The light of the gospel must first shine into the heart, "to give the light of the knowledge of God, in the face of Jesus Christ." And this knowledge must be communicated in WORDS, by which alone the human soul can be made acquainted with the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he has sent—whom to know is "eternal life." Hence the angel commanded the apostles (Acts v. 20) to "speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life"; as Christ himself had, in like manner, commanded them to preach to every creature that gospel which reveals to the soul the ineffable love of God, and becomes "the power of God for salvation to every one who believes."

It is, therefore, in entire harmony with fact and in perfect accordance with the laws of the spiritual system, that the change effected in the recovery of man, is, elsewhere in Scripture, exhibited to us as a *regeneration*. The spirit of God, addressing man's spiritual nature through the appointed means of communication, effects therein a spiritual change. No earthly power, no fleshly effort or alliance can accomplish this. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." The children of God are born, "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." It was to "as many as received him" that Christ "gave the power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." In this presentation, we have again, most clearly and explicitly stated, the means through which man may enter into possession of "that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." The gospel of God's grace is here the implanted germ of the spiritual life, and God's children are therefore "born not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." "Of his own will," says James, "begat he us by the word of truth." Hence he who receives "the word of the truth of the gospel," and believes on the Lord Jesus Christ, as therein revealed, "is begotten of God." 1 Jno. v. 1. And "whosoever," says John, "shall con-

fess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." It is in being baptized into Christ that we confess and put him on. It is in being "buried with him by baptism into death," that we, through faith, become assured of a participation in the benefits of his sacrificial death in the pardon of sin that separates the soul from God. It is in this most significant and symbolic institution that we are raised up with Christ, and "quickened together with him"; that we are born of water and spirit, and introduced into the kingdom of God, which is "righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit."* It is thus that Christ, having loved the church and given himself for it, sanctifies and cleanses it with the "washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing: but that it should be holy and without blemish." It is thus that God saves by the "washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he shed on us abundantly through Christ our Savior: that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life."

In view of the wonderful things which God has thus accomplished, and which he has in store for them that love him, how is it possible adequately to estimate the depth of the riches of his wisdom and knowledge—of his infinite mercy and condescension! The life which he imparts to the human soul, rests not inertly within the material tabernacle. The indwelling spirit quickens even the mortal body, and renders its members "instruments of righteousness unto holiness." Man being, from his peculiar nature, allied to both the material and spiritual systems, can never be permanently dissociated from those relations which determine his individuality and identity in the creation of God; and whatever affects the soul must, to the extent of its influence, involve the welfare of the body. Hence as, in the beginning, the death of the soul condemned the body to perish and to return to the dust from which it was taken; so, in the regeneration, the impartation of life to the soul, involves the redemption and glorification of the body, which is to be raised, no longer as a gross material frame, under the burden of whose lusts the struggling spirit groans, but as a spiritual body, consonant in nature with the soul itself, and fashioned like unto the glorious body of Christ. It is this trust in the *complete-*

* "For the explanation of this figurative description of the baptismal rite, it is necessary to call the attention to the well known circumstance, that, in the early days of the church, persons when baptized, were first plunged below, and then raised above the water, to which practice, according to the direction of the apostles, the early Christians gave a symbolical import.—THOLUCK on Ro. v. vi.

How sad a proof it is of the corruption of modern Christianity, that in the ordinary practice of modern churches, it is no longer "a well known circumstance" that believers are buried and raised again with Christ in baptism!

ness of Christ's redemption—this glorious hope in the ultimate perfection and glorification of man in his entire nature, that may well inspire our hearts, and lead every Christian to renewed diligence in his efforts to "crucify the flesh, with its affections and lusts," and to "perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord." For the renewed soul is here in a state of trial. It finds itself an alien and an exile, since its citizenship is in heaven; and it sighs evermore for its promised deliverance, and for these blessed abodes of joy and peace which shine in perennial beauty to the eye of faith.

This purification of the heart "from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit"—this preparation for a better and nobler sphere of being, is the great life-work of the Christian soul. And as there is nothing beautiful that is not pure, and the honor and glory of the future will be proportioned to personal sanctification here, how earnestly should all seek the highest Christian attainments, and continue to labor in the patience of hope, "waiting for the adoption, that is, the redemption of the body!" Of this struggle for eternal life, the world is unconscious. "The world knoweth us not." But God knows our heart-trials, and will aid our feeble efforts, working in us both to will and to do his own good pleasure. His blessed Spirit is ever ready to "strengthen us with might in the inner man," "to help our infirmities," and "to make intercession for us" according to the will of God. With him the poor struggling human soul is indeed one of the precious jewels that he will one day come to gather, though in the darkness of this world it be not seen or recognized. For in the darkness, all gems seem devoid of beauty, and cannot be distinguished by the touch from worthless pebbles. It is when the light shines upon them, and penetrates their interior and is reflected or refracted in innumerable tints of beauty, that the difference becomes apparent.

There is, perhaps, no type in Scripture which more clearly displays God's estimate of his people, and his final purpose with regard to them, than the one presented in the comparison before us. And it is one often employed for these purposes in the Scriptures. They are, indeed, God's "jewels." Paul in Corinthians, represents the truly converted as "gold and precious stones," built upon the glorious foundation, Jesus Christ. In the picture given by John of the ultimate destiny and glory of the redeemed, they appear as precious stones, garnishing the foundations of the walls of the heavenly Jerusalem, whose "twelve gates were twelve pearls," and whose "street was "pure gold, as it were transparent glass," and of which God and the Lamb were the temple and the light. But while the most precious things of earth are thus chosen to assure us of God's high regard, the analogy may also well serve as an additional incentive

to that self-examination and self-purification that are the appropriate labors of the Christian life. As the skillful lapidary brings forth to the light the gems of earth, and permits the solar beams to penetrate the substance of the crystal, in order that he may be enabled to detect any opacity or flaw; so should it be the daily duty of the Christian to admit into his heart the light of Divine truth, and to search diligently to discover his defects of character, in order to their correction.—Amidst the world's darkness these cannot be detected, for "that which makes manifest is light." How sad if, unnoticed and unremoved in this the day of trial, they shall be revealed to the universe in the light of heaven! How unfortunate, if, in that day, they shall consign the negligent and slothful to an inferior rank and a diminished glory!—For as there is "one glory of the sun and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars, and one star differeth from another star in glory," so also, we are informed, "is the resurrection from the dead;" and the beauty and glory of the spiritual body assigned to each redeemed soul, may be an exact exponent of its character in the sight of God.

Various, however, as may be the results in individual cases, who is there that can fail to admire the magnificence of the prospect presented to the Christian hope! How brilliant shall be the light that shines forth from Him that is Light itself, in "essence increate," and in whom there is no darkness at all! How glorious shall be the hues reflected or evolved from the massive pearls, and golden streets, and walls and palaces of the New Jerusalem, adorned with precious gems! How splendid the adamantine luster of the diamond; how bright the tints of the ruby; how charming the rich green of the emerald! How varied the softer green of the beryl and the chrysolite or the chrysoprase! How beautiful the variegated jasper, the yellow topaz, the violet-colored amethyst, the orange sardonyx! How sweetly shall the precious opal present, in its deep interior, its mysterious and ever changing play of colors; and the chatoyant sapphire evolve from its pellucid depths the varying blue of heaven! And how inconceivably magnificent shall be the resulting contrasts and combinations, when each, in accordance with its own peculiar character and structure, shall thus modify and radiate the light which it receives!

It is here also that these glowing symbols of Holy Scripture, chosen, doubtless, as the best means that earth affords to convey some notion of the inconceivable things which God has prepared for them that love him, may serve further to teach the lesson, that, as each precious gem acts differently upon light according to its own individual structure, so will each one of the redeemed retain his individuality, and reflect a spiritual beauty—the beauty of holiness—modified by

his own peculiar character. And not only so, but as no gem of earth, however precious, can originate a single ray or charm, but derives all its beauty from the light that falls upon it, and is variously analyzed within its substance, so it may be learned, that, however glorious the results, however varied the development of the Divine philanthropy, man, at least, can arrogate to himself no claim of credit, since he but reflects the glory of God, and returns nothing but what he has received. And, if all human boasting be thus excluded, ample ground is, at least, afforded for the confirmation of the Christian's faith and hope, since it leaves him dependent upon One who is omnipotent to save. Let us then labor to work out our salvation in the assurance that our labor will not be in vain, since it is God that worketh in us "both to will and do of his own good pleasure." And if, in the hours of darkness, amidst the trials of life and the temppations of the Evil One, we begin to doubt, from the ignorance and sinfulness of our hearts, the possibility of the promised glory, let us reflect that "with God all things are possible," and that he has already afforded us an all-sufficient evidence of his power, and, as it were, a very earnest of the future, in this, that he has taken the dark and filthy carbon which soils our fingers, and has converted it into the diamond, with all its transparency and lustrous beauty; and that he has constructed the beaming emerald and glorious sapphire from the very sand and clay which we tread beneath our feet! Oh! surely it is possible for God to take even man in all his sin and crime, and so change and purify his nature, that he may be at length crystallized into a gem of imperishable beauty. Oh! surely it is right for man to seek for honor, glory and immortality, and to cherish ever the noble and sanctified ambition of being admitted to that glorious throng of the redeemed, who, amidst the splendors of the spiritual universe, shall enjoy, in the Divine presence, fullness of joy and pleasure forevermore.

And as for those who have never yet acknowledged Christ; who have not come to him that they might have life; oh! that they might be induced to direct their attention to the things which belong to their eternal peace. May they be led to reflect upon the shortness and uncertainty of this fleeting animal life which affords them the only opportunity of securing deliverance from sin and death, and of attaining the priceless boon of everlasting life! May they be persuaded to confess the Lord Jesus, and through a life of self-denying obedience, "walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God"! "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city" For "there shall be no night there."

AN INFIDEL OBJECTION ANNIHILATED.

It was the remark of a sagacious politician, that "a lie would travel half round the world while truth was putting on its boots." We often see this verified in the rapid spread of infidel books—like those of *Colenso* and *Renan*—which in their bold assertion and plausible sophistry threaten, in their swift progress, to sweep away all the ancient landmarks, and to leave behind only the desolation which tells of a triumphant and resistless march. But after a time, Truth, with a patient bearing, and steady pace, comes along; and in the light of her heavenly presence, a more vigorous life springs forth, and a richer harvest waves in golden splendor on the desolated fields. We miss only the thorns and and thistles of error—the noxious weeds and poisonous plants which the enemy has borne off as his richest spoil, and which can be well spared from their usurped dominion in the territory of divine revelation.

An instructive instance of this is before us. Colenso insists that the reading of the blessings and the cursings of the law from Gerizim and Ebal, to two millions of people, is a sheer impossibility. "For surely no human voice, unless strengthened by a miracle of which the Scripture tells us nothing, could have reached the ears of a crowded mass of people, as large as the whole population of London."

We do not pause to notice the essential difference between the fact that the law was *read* in the presence of the assembled tribes, and the fact that when read, it was *heard* by all. The former fact the narrative assets; the latter, it does not assert. It is no uncommon thing in our own country, to find a much larger audience present than a speaker can successfully address. But if twenty thousand persons were present at a national Fair, and but ten thousand could hear the orator of the day—who would be be so silly as to attempt to prove that the other ten thousand were not there, because they failed to hear the speaker! or that it was false that any speech was made, since there were more persons present than one man could address!

The fact is, that in a well arranged camp, like that of Israel, if the the heads of the tribes and families heard the law, the end was abundantly served—since through them, it would soon be communicated to their subordinates. But we have an interesting statement of fact to place in opposition to to the uninstructed fancy of Colenso. The Rev. John Mills, an English clergyman, has recently published a volume giving the results of a three months' residence at Nablus, at the foot of these mountains. We submit an extract from this work:

"Let us now pause for a moment to review this wonderful event All the people betake themselves out of their tents on the plain, and make their way from all directions to the valley between the two mountains. The ark is placed in the middle of the valley, with the 'heads of the people' ranged on each side. The Levites of the one-half of the tribes stood upon the lower spur of Gerizim to read the blessings, and the Levites of the other half stood upon the lower spur of Ebal to read the curses. The vast congregation filled the valley; and the women and children covered the sides of the mountains like locusts. The Levites on Mount Gerizim then read the blessings, and the Levites on Ebal read the cursings—to which the vast multitude responded, Amen! What a sublime sight! A congregation and a service, compared with which all other assemblies the world has ever witnessed dwindle into insignificance!

"Those who have seen the spot, and have examined it, can readily realize the scene. Just where the two montains approach each other nearest are the two lower spurs, looking like two noble pulpits prepared by nature, and here the Levites would stand to read. The valley running between looks just like the floor of a vast place of worship. The slopes of both mountains recede gradually, and offer room for hundreds of thousands to be conveniently seated to hear the words of the law. The first time I stood upon that lower spur of Gerizim, the whole scenery struck me forcibly, as if Divine Providence had conformed its physical features on purpose to meet the requirements of the occasion.

"To this simple narrative an objection has been brought, alleging that the distance between the two mountains is too great for the human voice to traverse. And this objection would have greater force still with those who imagine the reading to have taken place on the very summits of the mountains—an idea which has no foundation in the Scripture narrative, although some Christians, as early as Jerome, as well as Josephus and the Talmud, seem to have adopted the notion. In reply to this objection, authors have generally pointed out the great difference in the state of the atmosphere in that country compared with that of our own; and how much farther one can see and hear in Palestine than in Great Britain. Travelers have been surprised at these apparent phenomena in Palestine and Syria. We had a remarkable example on the very spot under notice. One day when passing down the valley, we heard two shepherds holding conversation. One was on the top of Gerizim, out of our sight, and the other was close by us in the valley. Dr. Robinson mentions a spot in Lebanon where the voice can be heard for two miles.

"I am not aware whether any experiment to test the point had ever

been made upon the spot previous to the one about to be mentioned.—Having satisfied myself more than once during my stay in Nablus of its feasibility, and remarking this to my native friends there, a party, including Amram the priest, agreed to go to the spot and test the question. Circumstances, however, prevented us from carrying out our resolution. But before I left the country two friends joined me, the Rev. David Edwards, of Newport, and Mr. John Williams, of Aberystwyth; and on our way northwards from Jerusalem we resolved to make the experiment. We had pitched our tent in the valley near the foot of Gerizim, on the line between the two mountains, where I have supposed the ark to have formerly stood. I clambered up Gerizim, and Mr. Williams up Ebal, Mr. Edwards remaining with the men at the tent. Having reached the lower spur, I found myself standing as it were upon a lofty pulpit, and my friend found himself similarly situated on Ebal. Having rested awhile, I opened my Bible, and read the command concerning the blessings in Hebrew; and every word was heard most distinctly by Mr. Edwards in the valley, as well as Mr. Williams on Ebal. Mr. Williams then read the cursings in Welsh, and we all heard every word and syllable. Before we descended, Mr. Edwards requested us to sing, and gave-out, "Praise God from whom all blessings flow," &c. I commenced it upon the tune Savoy, or the Old Hundredth; but as I was standing upon a very elevated pulpit, I pitched the tune in a key too high for them to join me. I was determined, however, to sing it through; and if ever I sang well and with spirit, I did so then on Gerizim, and was heard most distinctly by all. And it was our impression at the time, and still is, that, if the whole area before and around us had been filled with the hundreds of thousaands of Israel, every soul amongst them would have heard every note and word with perfect clearness."

Thus it is that shallow sophistry and ignorant criticism—bats of the twilight—flee before the clear, strong light of truth. There is always this difference between the plausible themes of error and the harsh aspects of truth: the former, like artificial flowers, look beautiful at a certain distance, but on close inspection, are stripped of all their attractiveness; while the latter, like all the works of God, will bear the closest inspection, and appear more divinely beautiful as they are more dilgently scrutinized. We must place Colenso among those who "desire to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm." I. E.

Envy thou not the oppressor, and choose none of his ways.

CHRONICLES.

There are certain unwritten Chronicles, quietly resting in the mind which it would be interesting and profitable to improvise at certain periods of our life. They are not always at command, and only in propitious moments can we recall them. They undergo a "sea-change" amidst the ever-restless and often turbulent condition of the mind which holds them; and they derive a new interest from the circumstances which invest them; and the daily events in life which surround us are the phases of a higher life to which they have led. I feel tempted to reveal to you some of things which are passed, and bring them forth in such vivid forms that they shall seem to be realities. And truly, what are more substantial than the ideas which have given birth to new Institutions or have revived those which are lost. Are we not at liberty to re-enact a part which has been played, though the original actors have left the stage; and will not the characters and events appear as distinct and truthful as if they were of yesterday?

The class of men which figured in the dim regions of that period to which my "Chronicles" refer, is rapidly fading away, and the times which held them. Men die, and the age they lived in, dies with them, but not the part they acted. They leave something behind them which would not have been but for the part they acted. Unconsciously, they are making history, and the effects are certain and inevitable. The wave as it comes rolling up to the beach, may be ignorant of what it does, but some debris is left, some sea-weed is deposited, perhaps a portion of some wreck, or a few more grains of sand. It gives something, and takes away often more than it gives; but in either case, the shingly shore is not the same as it was, and never will be again.

We are all inheritors, not original granters; no one can claim a title, which has not passed through other hands; some one has held it before. Even our vast prairies, now cut up into sections, and fragments, were owned by the Indian tribes, and the Buffaloes. God alone, is the rightful claimant of all things. It was beautifully said by Solomon at the dedication of the temple, "But who am I, and what is my people, that we should be able to offer so willingly after this sort? *For all things come of thee, and of thine own have we given thee.*"—"Our own," has not yet been given us, and will not, until we have fairly and honestly made it. How it will be given, and under what conditions, we may not know. The Great Teacher seems to hint something in this direction:—"If ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own?"

The language in which we clothe our thoughts was made by others

before we were born; and truly now and then we coin a new word; but the metal existed in some other mint or the thing or person which gave birth to it, represented the word, and we simply saw it and spoke it.

How strange is the *myself*, now, to what it was in 1823. I can hardly believe that I am the same person. I am, and therefore I was; at least I feel so; and yet, but for this conscious personal identity, which admits of no logic but that which is beyond all logic, I would doubt. I do not think, that this our life is a dream, at least I have not so found it. There has been too much of the real to suppose that it was all ideal. We all have our reveries, but the sharp angles of life against which we run, wound us, and we know that there is something solid here, in despite of cloud land.

As we grow older we live in the past; our thoughts glide backward insensibly. The familiar faces of childhood are around us, beautiful as then. It is not the living that rule us, but the dead. It is not the living that are with us, but those "who are and are not."

The old College grounds I have not seen for many years. I shall probably not see them again. The stately Halls of the University have long since been laid in ruins. The old President is dead. He was a noble looking man, of aspect kingly. It would have done you good to look upon that face and reverend head. He was bald, with only a dark crescent of hair on the occiput. His eyes were full of light and quick with intelligence. And what a voice! A Latin sentence from his lips, brought you to the Forum. It was Cicero risen from the dead. Every word, every letter even to the consonants he spoke with such distinctness, you could see them leaping forth out of his mouth. He was a finished orator; a fine scholar, a pleasant companion, a good Teacher, a great man,—but he was a lover of "this world." He had a name to live but was dead. Poor man! he could pray like Jeremy Taylor and act like Lucifer. He died with the yellow fever, and the ocean holds his remains.

I met a few days since with two of my old *chums*. We talked and laughed and sighed. We are now old men and gray; and two of us have long *moustaches*—which would have been abjured in the days of "Auld lang syne." Times change, and so of the *hirsute* appendages. The world does move, though sometimes I fear downwards as our beards. In the parlor of my old friend I saw his portrait and that of his youthful wife. When taken they had but recently married.—How changed! "Is this you, brother George?" "It was," said he. It was and is not. We say of the living what we say of the dead. In the resurrection, the portrait may be the type and symbol of the man. The old will be renewed. We go, in this life, from

youth to old age. In the next, from old age to youth. Is not the resurrection a birth? What trailing thoughts of that world in which we now live, will follow us in the next. The murmurings of the distant sea, will be heard on the farther shore. The pre-existence, will then be a reality, and we shall not lose anything of all that is valuable, we have found in this. A single thought, or emotion—a sentiment, is enough for a sermon now; the garnered riches of this world's labor, suffering and toil, will keep us busy for ages in the world to come. My friend, that sick-bed will be a couch of roses to you some day above. That sad bereavement, which made you go mourning all your days, will add a new star in your crown of rejoicing. That temptation, so strong, so bitter will be the wine of angels. That path so rugged—so thorny, with the cross upon your shoulders, will be the golden pavement of the New Jerusalem. The present suffering state of the Kingdom is allied to the cross. It has its key-note in the wail of Gethsemane. It has found expression above, in the tears of the Great Weeper and the throes of the man of sorrows. "Much tribulation" is written on its portals. A life of faith, has to do with the Invisible. The present is a night—no day has yet dawned upon us. But "the night is far spent." Far spent! The morning then is at hand. A day is coming without a night. We walk now by the stars, and often through mist and storm, and darkness. The day is dawning. The first day of a glorious week. The jubilee of a new Creation. "The ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shal obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

J. C.

"CHRIST MADE A CURSE."

That Christ was made a curse, is admitted by all who receive the Scriptures as a divine record; that it was the curse of God he was made or endured, there are those who deny, affirming that only the curse of wicked men and evil spirits fell upon his head. Certainly from these sources there was no lack of cursing, in one sense; alas! he was defamed and blasphemed, wished and called accursed, not sparingly, by those whom he came to bless. This truth we hesitate not to admit. But that this is all or even any part of what is comprehended in his "being made a curse for us," should not be granted without proof, nor hastily denied without examination. Let us rather first investigate the subject and patiently await the conclusion. When we have learned under whose curse humanity was placed by sin, and *how*

it was removed, we will have no difficulty in deciding this question. "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them" is the announcement of heaven to man. To continue in these things without failure in any particular is and ever was, an impossibility on the part of sin-stained human nature; hence it follows that "all the world became guilty before God" when tested by the perfect law under which they were placed. The curse pronounced—the curse of God—was consequently suspended over the head of every human being. Is it suspended still? It is not.—Was it withdrawn and the sword sheathed without smiting sin? by no means. Did it fall upon the transgressors? It did not. It fell upon humanity in the person of Jesus the Christ. But let the language of an apostle decide this. "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law being made a curse for us." Since then we are redeemed in this way, whatever curse was over us came upon him and we have seen that it was the curse of God. If what he bore was only that which the laws and passions of envious men heaped upon him, how could that redeem mankind from the condemnation of the pure and holy law of God? The treatment that Jesus received from the hands of wicked men, one would think, would rather add to the condemnationsof the world than procure its redemption. It would be passing strange if God would accept as the price of human deliverance, the indignities that were heaped upon his Son. No one will say this, it is replied. True, but does not he who affirms that the Savior bore only the curse of men, force this meaning into the above scripture? Let us read it so and see. "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law being made the *curse of men for us!*" That this is not the meaning of the passage is manifest from its absurdness; besides the sentence which the apostle immediately quotes from the twenty-first chapter of Deuteronomy, to confirm what he had stated, leaves no doubt as to his meaning. It is this: "cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." He gives us the sense of the passage he quotes though not the exact words. The words are, "he that is hanged is accursed of God." So that our conclusion is just as satisfactory as though he had said, "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made the curse of the law for us, for it is written he that hangeth on a tree is accursed of God."

But, says an objector, it is not in harmony with our views of a God of love and justice to suppose that he would bring upon a perfectly innocent being the punishment deserved by the guilty. And might it not be said with equal propriety, that it is not in keeping with our knowledge of God's character to snppose He would allow one entirely free from sin to suffer a single pang, or shed a bitter tear, or undergo

anything that is not the legitimate reward of a perfectly pure and holy life. Granting this—for we believe that perfect enjoyments, without a single feeling of pain, surround constantly all the perfectly innocent ones of God's vast creation—does it follow from this that Jesus suffered not for us—that the chastisement of our peace was not laid upon him? By no means. He suffered not as the Innocent One—but as one who was guilty. Before he could suffer in any way, it was necessary that in the sight of law he should be regarded a sinner. How was he so regarded? Not only by taking our nature upon him, and being found in fashion as a man; for it was perfect human nature he assumed. Nor was it merely by "being made under the law," and thus coming under obligations to fulfill it in every particular; for this he accomplished—"he did no sin"—so that, viewed in the light of his life, the law pronounced him without spot—the law that pronounced us guilty.

But Jesus stops not here, thanks to his name; he takes our sins upon him—"the Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all." The law under which he had voluntarily placed himself, viewing him in this new attitude, exclaims, he is guilty—the guilt of the world being regarded as his—seize him; "awake, O sword, against my shepherd;" he is taken; the curse pronounced against us for our sins falls upon him when they are laid upon him; thus he redeems us from the condemnation of law, being made that condemnation for us. He suffers not then as one who is innocent; having voluntarily assumed the sins of the world, he is regarded as a sinner. This is clearly what the Apostle Paul means, when he says, "He made him who knew no sin to be *sin* for us, that we might be made the *righteousness* of God in him." How was he made *sin?* Just in the sense that we are made *righteousness.* "Abraham believed God, and it was *counted* to him for righteousness. Believers are not, but are *counted* righteous, by faith; Jesus was not, but was *counted* a sinner, when our sins were assumed by him; and as a result of this, was made a *sin-offering*, that it might be possible on the part of God, in harmony with the highest interests of all the Intelligences He had made, and His own justice, to view man as innocent in His sight. In some versions of the New Testament we read, "He made him a sin-offering." The grand truth remains the same, no matter which is correct; but it appears very evident that the common version presents the thought in the strong light in which the apostle intended to express it, showing the antithesis between our being *regarded righteous*, and Jesus being *regarded a sinner*; it is evidently this he has in view. He sees a striking contrast as well as a remarkable similarity in regarding one who knew not sin, as a sinner, and those who knew not righteousness,

as righteous, each being regarded what he is not, and treated accordingly; hence he expresses it in these strong and expressive words: "He made him to be *sin* for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the *righteousness* of God in him." There is nothing in the word—and certainly not in the connexion—that demands it to be translated *sin-offering*; for it is the same that is found in the expression, "knew no sin."

I profess not to fathom the mysteries arising from the contemplation of this wonderful imputation of sin and righteousness where they do not meritoriously belong. But deny this imputation, and the mysteries are multiplied. Deny it, and then what becomes of the "shadows of good things to come, unfolded to us in the offering of lambs on Jewish altars, as sacrifices for sin, as also in the bearing away into places uninhabited, the sins of the people, by a goat upon whose head they were placed. Deny it, and then tell how the guily can stand acquitted in the presence of God, who is holy and just. Having done this, account for that burdened voice murmuring in mournful tones through the Olive trees in night's gloom; "My soul is exceedingly sorrowful unto death"—"O my Father if it be possible let this cup pass from me;" and then that ever-memorable and deeply significant exclamation "My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" It makes me sad to think that there are those who would dwindle the sufferings and death of Jesus into those of a martyr. If this were the case, how is it that those, whose lives have all along, from the cradle to the stake, been stained by sin, are permitted to smile in composure of soul at the immediate prospect of death; while He, whose life was tainted by no sin, having always done those things pleasing in his Father's sight, shrank from the dreadful hour saying, "Now is my soul troubled and what shall I say? save me from this hour? but for this purpose came I to this hour." "This purpose"! there is meaning here; to bear the burden of this hour was the awful and sublime purpose of his life and mission: this passed he could say, "It is finished." Jesus came to death when clouds and darkness veiled the sky, that we might approach it in the smile and sunlight of heaven. Reader, pause ere you belittle the sufferings of Jesus into those of a martyr.

H. M.

There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty.

The liberal soul shall be made fat: and he that watereth shall be watered also himself.—Prov.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN CHURCHES.

[We wish to allow a full and courteous hearing to both sides of this question, and therefore cheerfully present the following well written plea of our Bro. Salisbury. We can and ought to discuss this question with good men kindly, and without the imputation of heresy against its advocates.—W. K. P.)

There is no fact more clearly stated in Scripture, than the use of instrumental as well as vocal MUSIC, both to excite and to express the feelings of true religious devotion. The triumphal song, composed by Moses upon the passage of the Red Sea, was sung not only with voices, but with instruments; and such a mode of singing it was as much sanctioned by the God by whose inspiration Moses acted, as the sentiment of the ode itself. And from that time forward, the purest and most exalted acts of devotion among the *chosen people*, were expressed by instrumental as well as vocal music. See 1 Sam. 10: 5, where it is said, "Thou shalt meet a company of prophets coming down from the high place, with a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp before them; and they shall prophesy." This, it must be considered was a school of the prophets, or a collection of persons wholly devoted to the service of religion, enjoying the divine afflatus or spirit of prophecy, enabling them not so much to foretell events, as to worship God with the sentiments of an elevating, lofty and inspiring devotion. And various instruments of music, conjoined no doubt to the tones of the human voice, were used to express those noble and inspiring sentiments. And so powerful was the effect of their melody, that the sympathies of Saul were kindled,—just as profane persons are now, sometimes, by the spiritual music of God's children,—and he joined in the worship, which led to the saying, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" No one that has the least claim to candor and judgment, can fail to recognize in this record of Hebrew history, the clearest evidence that the use of instrumental music by Moses was not an isolated case, but it entered into the forms of worship established by God himself among that people, insomuch that in the time of Samuel, and doubtless with the sanction of that prophet, it was habitually used in the most spiritual and exalted exercises of devotion.

Indeed, instrumental music was employed to assist the inspiration of the prophets, as will be seen from 2d Kings, 3: 15, where it is said that Elisha called for a minstrel, "and it came to pass when the minstrel played, that the hand of the LORD came upon him." And there is as much evidence that David acted under the inspiration of God in appointing twenty-four bands of musicians from the sons of

Asaph, Heman and Jeduthan, to praise God in the tabernacle with instrumental music, as in any other act of his life.

And those beautiful psalms, which give expression to the feelings of piety in *all ages*, were the most of them composed to be used in that delightful combination of vocal and instrumental harmony, which distinguished the tabernacle and temple worship. If David acted from merely human impulses in appointing these musical bands with their various instruments, how should the Holy Spirit have inspired the Psalms which he wrote to be used by those bands? Would God thus sanction David's impertinence in appointing these human inventions to his worship? No, they were not human.

"And he set the Levites in the house of the LORD with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of David, and of Gad the King's Seer, and of Nathan the prophet; for *so was* the commandment of the LORD by his prophets." 2 Chron. 29: 25.

They were of God's own appointment, that thus he might adapt his worship to that constitution with which he has endowed us. Nor can the abuse, of which wicked men were afterwards guilty, in "inventing to themselves instruments of music like David," and thus perverting to carnal, convivial and bacchanalian purposes, this part of Heaven's own institution, be urged as an argument against it. We might as well urge the senseless mummeries of a Catholic mass against our Lord's institution of his last Supper, and thus impeach his wisdom in giving us an ordinance to be so much abused. Alas, what ordinance of religion is too holy for a carnal heart to seize upon, as a means of its own impure gratifications? "Inventing to themselves instruments of music like David," is far from being the only instance of such sacrilegious abuse.

In no particular does God's institution of worship more exactly accord to nature, than in the vocal and instrumental harmony with which it is accompanied.

The sympathies which melody, acting upon the ear, kindles in the soul, are more profoundly pleasing and glorious, than almost any other that are conveyed to us through the channel of the outward senses. And on this account it is that the Spirit of inspiration calls upon us to "make a joyful noise unto God all ye lands; sing forth the honor of his name; make his praise glorious." "Rejoice in the Lord, O ye righteous; praise is comely for the upright. Praise the Lord with harp; sing unto him a new song; play skillfully with a loud noise: for the word of the Lord is right, and all his works are done in truth." How beautifully do sentiments like these chime with the harmony of the believing soul, and with the melody of outward nature!

All things are full of music and poetry, as well as piety and devotion. From the violet that decks the vale, to the oak that proudly lifts his head above the mountain's summit; from the bubbling rill that the thirsty ox might drink dry, to the proud Pacific with its roaring world of waters; from the the whispering zephyr of spring, to the howling tempest of winter; from the sweet note of the robin and the blue bird, to the deep bass of old ocean or the rumbling of distant thunder,—all in their sphere are alike organs of the Deity, and redolent of truth and eternity, all ministers to the UNIVERSAL song of nature in praising "Him who is first and midst and without end." Now by the introduction of music into his worship, vocal and instumental, God not only adapts it to the constitution of man, but makes it, so to speak, a copy of nature, where "the fish leaping up from the stream dumbly means his praise."

There is no other transfer of the instrumental music of the Old Testament into the New, except in the use made of it to illustrate the worship of heaven, whose harpers are represented as harping with their harps and thus singing a new song before the throne of God. The imagery is here derived from the temple worsip where, when the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound to be heard in blessing and praising the name of the Lord, and when they lifted up their voice with the trumpets and cymbals and instruments of music and praised the Lord, saying, for he is good; for his mercy endureth forever, then the most sublime and glorious results followed, and the house was filled with the glory of the Lord.

These scenes of the temple, with which John had been familiar, are taken to represent the praises of glorified spirits above; a fact that shows the extraordinary elevation of pious sentiment, of which they were the instruments in a holy and devoted mind. Among all the rebukes which our Lord administered against the temple worship of his time, not a word is said in condemnation of the instrumental and vocal music which made so important a part of it. No, he knew too well its fitness as a means of exciting and expressing the devotional feelings. To suppose that the Christian spirit is adverse to the use of the melody of the voice or the melody of instruments in the worship of God, would be to array it against nature, and against the indestructible elements of man's constitution, yea against the practice of pious men in all ages.

S. SALISBURY.

MUMFORD, N. Y.

He that walketh in his uprightness, feareth the Lord: but he that is perverse in his ways despiseth him.

SHORT PAPERS.—NO. 1.

"Stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the Gospel." Philip. 1: 27; Jude 3. Comp. Titus 3: 10.

Heresies and false doctrines—these inevitable offenses, foretold in the New Testament, and that have marked the entire history of Christianity—arose in the bosom of the church. The motives and elements of these had their origin in the inherent corruptions of human nature left within the body, and in the workings of Satan from without;—both of which are to be found wherever fallen humanity is. For, the Christian church has in it two elements, the divine and the human; a distinction of the highest importance, as without recognizing it, no one can understand, or pass a right judgment upon, the history of the church. The divine element—sometimes by theologians called the objective—is perfect, and, therefore, incorruptible and unchanging, from the beginning of the gospel, the same to-day, yesterday, and to the end of time. As its author, it is neither subject to change nor decay. But this body of divine truth and divine life, sometimes called the Gospel, the New Institution, is not to be given to angels, or to perfect, sinless, infallible beings, but to man. He is to hear, understand, believe, accept, and appropriate it to himself, and reveal it in his thoughts and general life. He, as an indispensable agent, is to preach it to others, apply it to others; as a Christian ruler, to judge others by it. This is the human—called the subjective, side, the fallible element in the church, and this, not the divine, is the fountain of errors, heresies, and all sins in the church. Here is where Satan finds a vulnerable place, and here he seeks his opportunity.—Why not avoid this fallible side? Because the very purpose of the remedial scheme involves the necessity of this active participation of humanity. Without it, the plan of salvation could not be such as God has revealed it to us. This clear distinction justifies God and his truth, and keeps our faith in them unshaken amid all the errors in the church. It teaches us where these errors arise, and as long as man is in the flesh and on earth, there is need of constant vigilance to guard ourselves and the cause of God against them.

Now one of the characteristics of radical and mischievous errors and heresies, is, that they always seek to identify themselves with, live, and maintain themselves in, the church as long as possible.—Their efforts in this direction are generally very strong and persistent. It is only by very vigorous, radical and timous efforts that they can finally be driven off. The reasons of this fact are, we think, obvious. First, these heresies desire to abide in the bosom of the church, in

order to work there like a leaven, to pervade and gain the whole mass; for heretical error has a passionate spirit of perseverant proselytism. This all history teaches, and none more so than the history of religious errors. The errorist knows that the quiet tolerance of his heresy in the church shuts the eyes of the many to its true character, and affords him a fine opportunity without offense, quietly and with success, to disseminate and establish his poison. Secondly, in its beginning and nascent weakness, error could not maintain itself before the world in separate existence, isolated and unprotected by a sheltering body of character and power. For these reasons the advocate of new doctrines in the church, although he well knows the radical, irreconcilable difference and hostility between his new creed and the established faith of the church, and that he must and will, some day, separate himself from the church, will, nevertheless, try to remain as long as possible under the covert of the maternal roof. The errorist is often sustained and urged on by an infatuated blindness as to the true character of his new dogma, and by an enthusiastic, extravagant hope—the ever-attending delusion of the errant, fanatical innovator—of making great and easy conquests at home. Not seldom, however, it is evidently a mere Jesuitic, and surely very uncandid and dishonorable maneuver, to hide under the cover and enjoy all the advantages of home, only because the circumstances are not yet favorable for a full, undisguised revelation of himself, which, however, is to be made as soon as all the plans are complete, and all the advantages are secured from home relations; and then the so long fondly cherished alliance is to be abandoned and denounced.

Radical and essential differences cannot long abide together in peace. No two can long "walk together except they are agreed"!—All efforts to reverse this law are unwise, injurious and vain. We have no doubt that the ground laid down in our plea for reformation, for the union of Christians on the basis of primitive Christianity, is correct, alone allowable and tenable, and will alone be successful.—It is, freedom in mere matters of opinion, in matters indifferent, but union in the great cardinal truths of the New Covenant. This is what we understand that ground to be. This great proposition made to the Christian world, must, however, be well understood, and fairly and fully accepted, if the union is to be a true, real and permanent one, acceptable to God, and desirable to true Christians. First, it must be clearly understood what are opinions, and what essential truths. It is quite possible to make very serious mistakes here; and such have been made by misguided men among us, and by others without, concerning us. A very gentlemanly and accomplished emissary of the Boston Unitarian Mission Society, once proposed to us

that, as we advocated freedom in matters of opinion, he could not see why we could not unite with all other "liberal" denominations, as Universalists, Unitarians, Swedenborgians, &c., &c. We told him, his error was, in not knowing that what he and these other "liberals" regarded as opinions, we held as vital, fundamental truths. Ignorant and false men among us have often persistently endeavored to introduce injurious errors, from a like misapprehension, as well as not seldom from willful perverseness.

In the second place, we must, and we hope always will, insist on a strict observance of both sides of this proposition, and as earnestly demand a true, full unity on the cardinals of the gospel, to be inviolably maintained, as allow freedom of opinion. Besides,—and this is to be most definitely understood and accepted,—these cardinals must be preached and taught, jealously and zealously kept and guarded, and these opinions,—that must embrace only things, differences about which do in no way affect the vital elements of our religion,—must be kept quiet, neither brought forward nor insisted on; and when pushed into notice, must at once be met and effectually rebuked. So, in like manner, the preacher that fails to hold up, to preach and to cherish the great fundamental truths of the gospel, must be rebuked and silenced. To fail to do this, is to fail in our duty and faithfulness to God, to His Word, to ourselves and to the world. The Christian church must stand on a foundation *well defined* and *positive*, and uncompromisingly maintain it. If we have no defined, positive convictions, no well-grounded faith, then we are not worthy to stand before God or man as the advocates of his truth, as teachers of men;—if we have, let us boldly stand upon them ourselves, in preaching and in life, and insist upon them from others. If this is not done, wo be to us in the future!

The charitable harboring of fatal errors, either from an organic inability to lay hold of and expel it, or from a false feeling of security that cares not, or a cowardice that dares not, grapple with it, has always, as we can every day see, led to fatal results. When once a pernicious doctrine has, by tolerance, been allowed for any length of time to live and move in the church, many weak and unguarded souls will be found to be infected, the virus spread, the souls of others imperiled, and the attempt then to root it out will cost much more trouble, and will be fraught with much more danger to the peace and safety of the church, than if the evil had at the very first been met and put away.

We said above that truth and error can not long go together, and that every effort to bear and dally with real and pernicious error is a dangerous charity, never commendable. What is said of murder,

may be said here also—"it will out." To attempt to make a truce of peace and silence with an ardent, determined errorist, is labor lost, and trouble gained. You may always rest assured of that, in spite of pleasant, soothing words to quiet your apprehensions. If he is not the meanest hypocrite, he *will* talk, he *will* advocate, he cannot be still, and the sooner the case is effectually decided, the better.

The question we have been discussing is marked, in history, by two great, characteristic, opposite tendencies. The one is, the disposition to bind the freedom of human thought and conscience by authoritative forms of faith, outside the Word of God, embodying the convictions of a certain movement and of a certain period. This is the tendency to creeds and to symbolism, that marked the period of the Reformation in the various centers of the Old World. This attempt, as the poet Schiller says, to cast into iron, changeless forms the religious discoveries and ideas of one period, and to confine with an anathema human thought within them—an ever vain and tyrannous endeavor—produced its inevitable ripe fruit, by calling forth in the opposite direction, equally pernicious and sinful, the licentious latitudinarianism of our day, that, under the inspiring cry of freedom, seeks to emancipate men from all bonds, and demands the right to believe and teach as gospel, anything and everything. These are the two extremes of the arc, in which the uneasy pendulum of the errant spirit of man is perpetually oscillating. While some, alarmed at the mad tendency of the hour, are seeking for the salvation of orthodoxy in the old symbolism of a past age, we rejoice to say, the majority of enlightened believers are learning a better lesson from the contemplation of the history of these two opposite, complemental forces. They are learning to understand and appreciate the great lesson we as reformers are endeavoring on this subject to impress upon men. Our position rejects with equal steadfastness both of these extremes, as alike false and fatal to Christianity. Ours it is to sail between this Scylla and this Charybdis, inclining to neither. On the one hand, we must maintain as a positive, decided principle, the rejection of every effort towards extra-scriptural confessionalism,—creeds, or formularies of doctrine and faith. This is to be regarded as fixed, settled, and irreversible. We are not afraid to utter these last words; for, while on the one hand we reject human fetters on the conscience, we equally reject the monstrous idea of having no determined, established principles to stand on for conviction and peace!—never to be sure that you are resting on a solid, immutable foundation of truth! We do not believe it is either necessary or wise to review and modify *all* your convictions and principles, every morning and every evening; to be "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."

God enables and desires us to gain solid ground—a "sure foundation" of faith, to stand on. With the same steadfastness, we must avoid also the other tendency. Because we will have no human creed, we must not allow a licentious liberty in faith and doctrine. Let us be firm here. Let us inflexibly demand the most cordial, faithful, and well understood acceptation of all the great, ancient truths of the Gospel, as once taught by Christ and his apostles. This is our high goal;—to win it; to show to the world the truth, the practicability and the success of this position, will be a transcendent triumph,—not for us, but for Christ and his truth. If we yield to the one side or the other, our vessel will meet a fatal shock. Christian men! stand and watch! C. L. L.

THE BAPTISM OF JOHN.

We are asked to explain the Baptism of John. Matthew tells us it was a "baptism in water in order to repentance,"* accompanied with the *preaching of repentance* by John, and the *confession of sins* by those who were baptized. Mark says John preached the baptism of repentance for "the remission of sins."† The subjects were not only required to confess their sins, but to bring forth fruit meet for repentance, and it is probable, from the declaration of Paul in the 19th ch. of Acts, that it was uniformly accompanied with a special requirement to believe on Him who should come after John, that is, the Christ, Jesus. The great motive by which John enforced this plea was, that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, and the special object of his mission was to prepare the way of the Lord.

From these scriptures we shall, perhaps, be able to gather a fair understanding of this subject. John was the predicted harbinger of Christ. Isaiah had promised his coming seven hundred years before,‡ and our Savior himself declares that he "is the Elijah that was to come," that is, the Elijah predicted by Malachi nearly 400 years before.§ Thus, we may say, the last utterance of the last of the Prophets is concerning this John and his work. Himself the subject of prophecy, he stands also as the last link in the prophetic chain, joining all to Christ. As a Harbinger, he is the immediate usher to Christ, so that nothing is left to conjecture or inference. The prophetic index reaches pointedly to Christ, and says "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world."

But before this, John had been preaching about Christ, and baptizing the people into the faith of his immediate coming. But in this he stands forth only as the the representative of the culmination of the

* Matt. iii. † Mark i. ‡ Isa. xl. 3. § Mal. iv. 5.

law and the prophets. None greater, indeed, had been *born of woman*, because he stood next to Christ, as a Harbinger. Other heralds had spoken from afar, announcing his coming, but John holds the first distinction of presenting him in person. Yet the least in the kingdom of Heaven, that is the least of those *born of the spirit* is greater than he, because John was only a representative, the last and the greatest it is true, but yet only a representative of that legal prophetic dispensation, which was now about to pass away. This he knew. Hence he said, speaking of Christ, He must increase, but I must decrease. As the splendid retinue of a king attracts all eyes, till the king in person begins to appear, and then passes rapidly out of notice, so John draws Jerusalem and all Judea to his baptism in the wilderness, and keeps them enchained by the magic of his preaching concerning Him that is to come, and the near approach of the kingdom, which he should establish. Yet so soon as Christ himself is manifested, and John declares him as the Lamb of God, so soon the interest is turned from John to Christ, and the ministry of the Baptist begins to lose its power.—Before the rising glory of the Gospel, the shadowy darkness of the law is dissipated, and the light breaks brighter and broader to the perfect day.

Now as the law never could give knowledge of the remission of sins, so John's Baptism, which really belonged to that state and dispensation of things, could only be for the remission of sins prospectively. This was also the case with the forgiveness that was connected with sacrifice. The blood of bulls and of goats did not and could not procure the remission of sins; it did not, and could not take away sin. No actual sense of pardon was conferred by John's baptism, because this can only be enjoyed, where the Holy Spirit is bestowed, but it was a baptism of repentance, that is, a baptism sealing a repentance confessed, and engaging to a life in harmony therewith, in order to the remissisn of their sins by Him who should come, that is Christ, whose kingdom was declared to be nigh. The baptism of John was, therefore, only a preparation for the forgiveness of sins, which should be conferred by Christ, upon such as were fitted thereby for admission into his kingdom.

It was a washing, indeed, but not of *regeneration*, as is Christian baptism. It buried the person in the death of repentance, but did not raise him out of it, for, it was of the letter, which killeth, and not of the spirit which maketh alive. Repentance is always a process of death. It is the putting to death, the crucifixion of the old man—but not the creating of the new man, which is only the "workmanship of God, created in Christ Jesus for good works." The baptism of John required repentance and committed to repentance. It brought

the party under the deep conviction and condemnation of the law, and left him there, to await, in hope the sense of the remission of sins, which should be bestowed by Christ. It was the last and crowning lesson of the law, which "was the tutor that led to Christ, that we might be justified by faith."

"But since the faith has come we are no longer under a tutor: for we are all the sons of God, by faith in Jesus Christ: for as many of us as have been immersed into Chist, have put on Christ." But to be immersed into repentance, is not to be immersed into Christ, and herein is the radical difference between John's baptism, and Christian baptism. John's baptism sealed the condemnation of the law, and killed; Christian baptism applies the blood of Christ, and saves; John's baptism left its subjects under conviction with only the *hope* of forgiveness; Christian baptism relieves the conscience by a sense of forgiveness actually bestowed;—John's baptism was upon the faith of a Savior who should come; Christian baptism is upon the faith of one who has already come and redeemed us by his blood; John's baptism breathed the spirit of the law which gendereth bondage; Christian baptism leads to the glorious liberty of the children of God; John's baptism, except in the case of Christ, was accompanied by no gift; Christian baptism is followed by the gift of the Holy Spirit; John's baptism was a preparation for a kingdom that was to come; Christian baptism introduces into a kingdom already established, even the kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; John's baptism conferred no rank; Christian baptism makes us sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty—immerses us into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. W. K. P.

WHAT IS THE PROMISE—GAL. 3. 29?

"In this verse, Paul says, 'If you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.' Please inform us what is the promise referred to." A. C. H.

Answer.—The promise referred to is stated in the 8th verse to be that in which the gospel was preached anciently to Abraham, saying, "In you shall all the nations be blessed." The conditions on which this promise was made, are given in Gen. 12. and repeated again in ch. 22. 16. But Paul, in this 3rd. of Gal. makes the whole matter perfectly plain. Since only a very limited part of mankind were the blood descendants of Abraham, it could not be in this way that all nations could become inheritors through him. But the ground of this promise was the *faith* of Abraham. "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." Hence, "those who are of

faith are the sons of Abraham"—and hence, by this principle of descent, his *heirs*. In this way all nations could become related to Abraham, since all nations can believe. God, then, purposing to justify the Gentiles, counted them also because of *their* faith, heirs of the blessing promised to Abraham, because of *his* faith. "So, then, those who are of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham."

But while the blessing was to be bestowed upon the principle of faith in him who should receive it, it was to come through Abraham and his *seed*, that is, through Christ. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of *one*, And to thy seed, which is Christ." So that the blessing waited till the manifestation of Christ, and "the law was added on account of transgressions, till the seed should come, to whom the promise was made." But now that Christ is come, the law is withdrawn, and we become the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus, "for as many of us as have been immersed into Christ, have put on Christ." We are the children of God, then, through a spiritual union with Christ, by *faith*, and not by blood, or nationality, or any human or civil regulation or relationship; and united thus in the same way, that is, by *immersion into him*, and by the same principle of *faith*, we are declared to be "all one in Christ Jesus," and "if we are Christ's, then we are Abraham's seed also, and heirs according to the promise." The promise, then, makes us, through Christ, and by faith, heirs, and as such, inheritors of eternal life, with all the riches of a boundless universe. W. K. P.

LETTER FROM JERUSALEM.

BRETHREN PENDLETON AND LOOS:—

* * * * * While I have pen in hand, I take occasion to briefly note such items of current matters and things in these ends—or rather beginnings—of the earth, as may perchance prove interesting to you.

The mail before last brought news of considerable interest from Constantinople—the conversion, or rather the Protestantizing of fifteen thousand Turks! What unexpected occasion of rejoicing! unless, indeed, it should turn out like the five thousand who, a few years ago, professed Christianity in that region, but after "during a while," concluded that they had no further use for such an antiquated production as the *Bible*—alleging that they themselves are inspired like their great prophet, to make new revelations better suited to the advanced state of humanity! But hoping better things in relation to the present movement, "I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice"; for it

shows, at the very least, that Christ is preached—the most imperative of all obligations of the church toward the heathen.

The news of this quintuple Pentecostal ingathering is much enhanced by a statement contained in the last *Levant Herald*, to the effect that the "Little Horn," so far from being broken off, as is generally contended, is again at its old work of "pushing." All missionary and even mere Bible-selling and translating operations, it would seem, have been peremptorily brought to a close by the Sultan, in utter disregard of the tolerant Firman extorted from him in 1856 by those great Moslem-upholding powers, England, France, Russia and Austria. The great point of interest is, whether the proper line of conduct has, in any manner, been transcended by the large, able and well-sustained corps of missionaries there: apprehension is indulged in some quarters, that the whole thing will turn out to have been a mere ecclesiastico-political movement, in which the great Oriental principle of 5 loaves plus 2 little fishes has exercised rather too much influence. But the thought has just occurred to me that you would like to see the paper containing the news; and hence I forward it.

All manner of toleration is practiced in this immediate region; but I am sorry to say that so far as this city and its immediate vicinity are concerned, there is nothing of the slightest interest in the missionary line. All the missionaries indeed have long since left the city, and are either rusticating in their usual summer quarters on Lebanon, or estivating in various parts of Europe. Much is being done, however, in behalf of education, industrial institutions, and general benevolence. Amongst other efforts, one of the missionaries, I learn, has lately collected a hundred thousand dollars in the United States for the purpose of establishing a large college in this city, in addition to the fine Institution they have long conducted in the mountains.

Dr. Vandyke informs me that he will soon complete the important work on which he has been so long engaged as successor to Dr. Smith—the new Arabic version of the Scriptures. Dr. Thompson has been spending some months in Egypt—very profitably employed in gathering materials for another work; and it is said will soon retire from the mission, and return to the United States for the purpose of putting it to press. Several new missionaries, however, are coming out for the purpose of re inforcing the mission, and some are already on the ground—either here or at other stations—war and impoverization to the contrary notwithstanding. England also sends a missionary to the Jews of this city, and the English-speaking sailors at this port. What are the Disciples of Christ doing in furtherance of the great commission entrusted to the church—preaching the gospel "in the regions beyond"—"teaching all nations" indeed?

The cultivation of cotton, superinduced here by that most horrible and inexcusable of all wars, still raging in our beloved land, has given a new impulse to industry and commerce in these capes. You will be pleased to learn, I doubt not, that manufactures and internal improvements are quite the order of the day in this long desolated land, not only amongst the Frank sojourners, whose influence, by-the-by, is most decidedly in the ascendant, but amongst the stolid Turks themselves. A very fine steam cotton establishment has just been set in successful operation in this city, and several steam silk factories in the mountains, as well as within the suburbs. A steam press has also been lately put in operation by the A. B. C. F. M., in addition to the large hand-printing establishment it has long kept busily employed in this city. A large break-water is about to be erected by a French company; steam carriages about to be placed upon the new Damascus road; and water brought from the River Lycus, some six or eight miles distant. And it is believed that at last, after so many fruitless efforts to procure a concession from the Sublime Porte, a railway is about to be laid down from Jaffa to the Holy City. But whether the Firman has been granted to Dr. Zimpel or to our English company applicant, I am not informed. Perhaps you are not aware that this very learned, excellent and benevolent brother, albeit somewhat eccentric, whom I had the happiness of baptizing in the Jordan about twelve years ago, has been spending many months, and much money too, I fear, at Constantinople, endeavoring to procure a concession from the Sultan for this purpose. The Euphratean railway, it is now positively asserted, is actually commenced, despite all obstacles—its entering point being, as of right it ought to be, "at the entering in of Hamath," just under the shadow of Mt. Casius, that ancient landmark of Moses—Mt. Horhor. The telegraphic wire now stretches in three directions from old Berytus, the Beeroth of Solomon, one of its branches running to Egypt via Jaffa and the City of the Great King! Shade of Solomon! Is not this at least "something new under the sun"?

But whither is my discursive goose-quill winging its way?—for I only intended jotting down two or three brief items.

Providence permitting, I shall set my face homeward once more ere many moons. All well; and would send greetings were they aware of this opportunity of conveying them.

The good Lord abundantly bless you both, and crown with richest success your work of faith, patience of hope and labor of love in behalf of the great cause to the furtherance of which you are consecrating your lives. With warmest Christian regards,

Most sincerely yours in the Lord, J. T. Barclay.

IS GOD THE AUTHOR OF IMPERFECTION?

Golconda, Ill., Nov. 29th, 1864.

Bro. Pendleton:—Is God the author of *imperfection?* I once heard a Universalist preacher make use of the following argument, in substance: The very idea of *creation* implies imperfection. Absolute perfection implies *self-existence.* God alone is self-existent; hence, he alone is absolutely *perfect.* The Almighty, though he be indeed omnipotent, cannot make a *created* being *absolutely* perfect. A *perfect creature* is a contradiction. Should God, the self-existent, and consequently perfect Creator, impart his perfection to another, that other would *not* be another, then, but *God;* since absolute perfection is predicable only of God, as the only self-existent being in the universe. Imperfection must, therefore, attach to every creature, notwithstanding the divine omnipotence and goodness; for *contradictions* are not objects of power. God, in his infinite wisdom and goodness, saw fit to produce external things, which things, as *creatures,* could not possibly be *perfect;* whence it follows, by a logical sequence, that imperfection originated with God himself.

That looks plausible and specious;—is it *true?* It is said, in His word, that "God is not the author of *confusion.*" But imperfection often results in confusion. If, therefore, God be the author of *imperfection,* he may be said to be, indirectly, the author of *confusion.* But this would prove the Scripture declaration false. "What shall we say, then?"

But you will doubtless reply—this is getting "wise above what is written"—this is an "untaught question," concerning which we never shall arrive at the truth, certainly. Granted; still I opine you will not deny us the right *opinions,* or the privilege of soaring a little into the regions of *speculation,* provided we do not venture beyond the *center of gravity.* Or, plainly, provided we do not push our speculations beyond their proper bounds, or propound our opinions in the spirit of a *dogmatist* or a *schismatic.*

In hope of a reply, C. J. Kimbal.

Reply.—The difficulty raised in the above query is only apparent. The reasoning is after the delusive method of the scholastics of the dark ages. It begins by assuming, as true, a general proposition expressed in words—then, defining these words in a particular sense, goes on by a process of logical inference, to draw such conclusions as the premises may allow. Now here are two wide doors opened for sophistry. *First,* the general proposition may not be true, in an

absolute sense. 2*nd.* The definition by which we limit the terms employed in expressing it, may not be correct. A mistake of a hair's breadth, in either case, will vitiate the whole argument.

The general proposition is, that "absolute perfection implies *self-existence.*" Now this we do not admit; and if it be erroneous, then the conclusion which is drawn from it is not proved. Surely the proposition is not self-evident: on the contrary, we think it untrue.—The error is in a false meaning attached to the word *perfection.* This word does not express the idea of *existence* at all, but only the *fullness*, the *entireness* of the *qualities*, *powers*, or *faculties* that properly belong to any particular *existence.* Hence we have three kinds of perfection according to the nature of the object or entity in which it is considered: 1st. Physical perfection; 2nd. Metaphysical or transcendental perfection; 3d. Moral perfection. *Physical perfection* is reached when any sensible object possesses in due proportion and proper arrangement all its natural parts and properties. *Metaphysical or transcendental perfection* contemplates substances as to their essential attributes; and requires the presence of all the *essentia*, the *elements*, absolutely necessary to the integrity of the substance. If it be God, then all defect is precluded, because in him all fullness dwells; but if some other being, then only the parts essential to the integrity of that being—for each one according to its kind. *Moral perfection* implies the full and entire possession of such moral qualities as the being is capable of. In God there is completeness of perfection; in created beings, finite limits are imposed on the range of power which it hath pleased the creator to bestow; and perfection is reached when such excellence as is required by the nature of the creature, is attained. Hence the perfection of the creature can never be that of the creator, any more than the finite can become the infinite. Yet it may reach in entire fullness the standard of its own type of being.

Will any one say that an atom of oxygen is not perfect? or that the result of the chemical union of oxygen and hydrogen is not perfect water? So, let the creator prescribe the nature of any created thing; when the archetype of the divine idea is realized in fact, fully and completely, then the creature is perfect. A man without an arm, would be physically imperfect; without body, soul and spirit, metaphysically imperfect; and without a conscience, pure and undefiled, morally imperfect.

Let us confine our attention to this last case, for it is upon this that the skeptic plants his batteries. It is admitted that man is morally imperfect. He has a darkened understanding and a polluted conscience. This the skeptic would argue is necessarily so, and God is the author of it. We say he was not created so, but has become so

by his own act. God made him perfect, according to the type prescribed in his own sovereign and creative will; but his very perfection required that he should have a free will. This was an absolute requisite to the full realization of the type. But free will involves the power to disobey law; and the transgression of law is sin.—Hence that which is one of the essentials of man's perfection, to wit, the free will, becomes by its very perfection the power by which he destroys the perfection of another quality, to wit, the conscience.—Our moral imperfection, then, is the result of our own act; we are the author of it, and not God. God is the author of our free will, but not the author of the acts of disobedience which, against his own expressly declared will, we, in the exercise of our freedom, choose to perform. Man's moral imperfection, therefore, is his own crime, and as such, justly punishable by the Creator, who made him and all things else "very good." W. K. P.

CHRIST—HIS TWO-FOLD NATURE.

It has become the fashion and a characteristic tendency of our day, to write, and otherwise set forth, the life of Jesus, especially in the ranks of a destructive, unbelieving, pseudo-Christianity. This is now one of the great religious controversies of Christendom. Some persist in seeing in Christ only the man, the human; and however they exalt him, they build only on and with the human, leading the *man* up by progressive, inner development, till he becomes—in their sense—divine. They set him forth to our contemplation and our faith, not, as he is indeed, "from above," but

"As if he from the earth had labored up;"

thus falsifying the claims of Jesus expressed in his own words, and in those of the evangelists and apostles, and utterly destroying the crown and glory of his character and work. Others, looking only at his divinity, lose sight of his humanity,—and so likewise err. This too is an error of great magnitude and grave consequence to our just apprehension and understanding of Jesus. This controversy is gathering into itself the learning and dialectic skill of the Christian world. Strauss came boldly forward into the arena and startled the world with his daring, destructive negations. This brought into the lists the great Neander. Later,—within a short period,—Renan's *Life of Jesus* has given a new impulse to this question. Prof. Schenkel of Heidelberg followed him, and although a theological Professor and high church-dignitary, unfortunately has trodden the same errant, unbelieving path; and the politico-ecclesiastical powers of Baden have

sustained him, against a very decided remonstrance from the more evangelical part of the clergy of that Duchy. Prof. Van Osterzee, of the University of Utrecht, has written a "Portraiture of Christ, according to the Scriptures";—a work, as we judge from the title, that is intended to be an answer to the Heidelberg Professor, the title of whose production is, "Portraiture of the character of Christ."—Singularly enough, these two men are co-laborers in Lange's great *Bible-Work*, a Commentary, with new translations, comprehending the whole Bible, the first volume of which has been lately translated and published in this country, and received the highest commendations from the religious, orthodox press. As Christians of unshaken faith in Christ and his salvation, we must, for ourselves and others, joyfully meet this question;—we must study it with renewed diligence and delight;—seek to know Christ more and more; and fearlessly—if well prepared—enter into the conflict, assured that nothing can result but victory for the truth.

We give below a translation of a characteristic passage of Prof. Van Osterzee's work, which, we trust, from the great interest inherent in the subject, will not be unwelcome to our readers.

C. L. L.

The divine and the human stand in Christ not externally alongside of each other, but are in an inner union with each other; and whatever the Lord on earth thinks, and speaks, and acts, is as little all human as it is exclusively divine, but perfectly divine-human.—It is the same divine-human consciousness that expresses itself when he says: "Before Abraham was, I am," and that confesses: "Of that day and hour knows no man, not the angels, nor the Son, but the Father only." It is the same divine-human will, that one time exclaims in sorrow: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass"; and at another time prays, "Father, glorify thy Son!" It is the same personality, in one word, that now sighs, and again rejoices; now agonizes, and again conquers; now declares, "I and the Father are one," and again, "The Father is greater than I." That at one time the human appears prominent before the divine, and again the divine before the human, it is not necessary nor proper to deny; but they never appear separated. That at one time it is exclusively the Son of God, and at another, exclusively the Son of Man, that speaks or acts or suffers, is one of those arbitrary imaginings, above which a believing, intelligent contemplation of the Lord's person and work must ever elevate itself. Nowhere does the Lord in his utterances establish the least opposition between his divine and human nature; nowhere can we detect a trace, that as God he would know, or will, or do precisely

the opposite of what, as man, he understands, or desires, or performs On the contrary, just as our human personality arises from the union of body and soul, which originally are distinct from each other, so the divine-human personality is the necessary consequence of a union of divinity and humanity, by which, in the consciousness of the God-man, all points, so to speak, flow into, and unite in, one. Thus he is tat he same time lord and servant; our creator and brother; king and slave; lion and lamb; almighty and weak; supremely exalted and deeply abased; the prince of life and a child of death; the Lord of glory and the man of sorrows. And all this is as little at variance with itself, as that man, as he is contemplated from his bodily or his spiritual side, should be at the same time a child of the dust and a citizen of heaven, a mortal and an immortal being, a little more than the beasts, and a little lower than the angels. Yes, that is precisely the weighty task and the high renown of faith, that it can behold in Christ, even in his lowest humiliation, not alone man, but at the same time also the Son of God; and again in the same Christ in his highest elevation, not alone the partaker of the divine nature, but also man. Whoever, in such a position of things, can take offense at the name God-man, shows that he does not yet comprehend the smallest part of the revealed mystery of the personality of our Lord.

Is it necessary to show more fully the importance of the proposition thus far discussed? Its importance appears of itself, as soon as it is evident that it is truth; for if this is the true nature of Christ, then every view of his person that is at war with this, is necessarily also onesided and false. Furthermore, it will ever more also be of great significance, because more than one important consequence can be drawn from it for a correct contemplation and judgment of the earthly appearance of the Lord.

If the Son of Man was, and knew himself to be, also the Son of the living God, then we can see the apparent opposition in him completely reconciled, and the most astonishing contradiction solved in a most glorious harmony. Do we desire a proof as to how far this union goes? We know no better one than in the words of a celebrated church-father. "What is more glorious than to behold in the form of man, Him who is the creator of men! He that is eternally in the Father's bosom, is conceived in the womb of an earthly mother. He that from all eternity is born of the Father without mother, in the fullness of time is born of a mother without Father. He that covers the earth with vegetation, that adorns the heavens with stars, and fills the seas with living beings, lies wrapped in swaddling clothes. He, whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, is enclosed in a manger and is nourished by the breast of his mother. He, whose wis-

dom is without beginning and without end, "increases in wisdom;" whose eternity neither increases or decreases, advances in age; He that is the origin of all grace, "grows in grace:" He, whom the creature adores, before whom all knees bow, is subject to his parents.—He is baptized, the Lord by the servant, God by man, the king by a subject. He, whom the angels minister unto, is tempted by the Devil. He, who is the bread, suffers hunger;—who is the fountain, thirsts;—who is the way, is weary. The glory suffers itself to be mocked, the majesty to be humbled, the life yields itself to death." To him, who denies either the eternal divinity or the real humanity of the Lord, such antitheses are nothing but senseless sounds, oratorical vanities, unallowable transfers of what originally belongs to one division, to another. But whosoever recognizes by his faith both sides of "the great mystery,"—to him these very contradictions, that might be multiplied infinitely, express the richness and the glory of the revelation of salvation in Christ, and to him they are a new testimony of the truthfulness with which the sacred Psalmist once sang to the praise of God: "He that lives on high, looks down upon all the inhabitants of the earth." Have not the Lord's apostles themselves given us examples of the utterance of such antitheses, as the above; which, moreover, are not the fruit of human thought, but inspired by God himself? What else does it signify when Peter declares to the Jews at Jerusalem: "You have killed the Prince of life;"—when Paul writes: "If they had known him, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory;"—when John describes as standing in heaven, "the Lamb slain from the beginning," and says that he heard sung to the Lord the song of the redeemed. As long as we do not forget, that such apparent humiliations and wants are ascribed to the Logos, not as to a divine person *per se*, but to the incarnate Logos; that as such he lies before us, as a babe, grows up, eats, drinks, dies &c., we know not what can hinder us, at the same time and in like manner to maintain the apparent contradictory in reference to this only God-man, for whom and in whom it is no longer an irreconcilable contradiction.

* * * * * * * * * * *

We must not forget that the same Christ at the same time possesses and unites in himself both kinds of properties, so that, indeed, the human has not become the divine, even as the divine has not been lost in the human; but, nevertheless, both natures have communicated to one and the same person all their properties. To speak with the great reformer (Calvin): "We hold, that the divinity is combined and united with humanity in such a manner, that each one of both natures has retained its fixed peculiarities, and of both one Christ has

been constituted." This union is essential, that in Christ man never alone thinks, or speaks or acts, while the divinity is inactive; nor, contrariwise, does the divinity appear as acting, while the humanity rests; but at the same time they are so inseparable, that, in all confidence, we can regard the one nature as participating in that, which in the nature of things can be done or suffered only by the other. God in himself, can as little suffer and sorrow, as lie prostrate and die.—But since God has become man in Christ, and the Lord in his humanity suffers and sorrows and laments, it cannot be otherwise but that also the divine nature in him must share personally and really in all this. And, reversed, where the God-man conquers death, and ascends the throne of the world, by virtue of the law of the most intimate union of life, the human nature in him must also be lifted up to the honor and dignity of the divine. Thus—but we hesitate to go farther, to wander about in the thorny thickets of theological strifes, where we more than ever become conscious of the narrow limits of our knowledge. We think, in time, of the words of Melanchthon: "This is to know Christ,—to learn and acknowledge his gracious benefits, and not, as others th seek to fathom too much the mystery of his natures, and of his incarnation."

UNSOUND ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF TRUTH.

The cause of truth is never promoted by an unsound argument offered in its support, however specious such argument may appear.—Truth needs no such support; "sound speech that cannot be condemned" being quite sufficient for all her purposes.

We have had for years past a set of arguments found in almost every section of our cyclopœdia that not only substantiate no truth, but, by the facility with which they are or may be answered, do a real injury. Gravely propounded by experienced controversialists as solid proofs of certain propositions, younger men confidently use them for the same purpose, never having heard of their logic being called in question. In the presence of a shrewd disputant, the truth might suffer; for a bad argument being refuted, the truth itself is often made to suffer.

As an example, take the following argument in favor of immersion: "John the Baptist could not have sprinkled the people in the Jordan, for sprinkling is predicated only of water, sand, ashes, and such like substances; and as John could not handle the people in this way, sprinkling is not baptism, for he surely did not sprinkle the people into the Jordan." The argument is based on the assumption that the metonomy is not an allowable trope—that language must always be

used without a figure of speech whenever the words in this controversy occur. But when an opponent quotes from the Bible a passage embracing the very word, *sprinkle*, used in the sense precisely that is denied in the above assumption, it is difficult for the most skillful defender of the true baptism to prevent the doctrine of immersion itself from suffering the fate of his bad argument. "*Moses sprinkled both the book and all the people.*" Here we must admit either the use of the above trope, or that Moses did literally "sprinkle the people."—If Moses literally sprinkled the people, why could not John do the same? If Moses did not really sprinkle them with blood, then the language must mean that he sprinkled blood upon them: and so it might be said of John that he sprinkled water upon them—baptized them with water, sprinkled them with water as Moses did with blood; that is, sprinkled the water upon them. Thus it is plain that such an argument only injures the cause of truth, and should never be used by any sound thinker.

In the controversy between ourselves and the other churches the latter have defended themselves by admitting that they may be wrong, probably, in some matters, but claiming to be *very near* the truth: so near as to entitle them to indulge the hope of immortality. To this it has been replied that a counterfeit bank bill may very nearly resemble the genuine, but is none the better for all that—that on the contrary, the more nearly it resembles the genuine the more dangerous, because more apt to pass as genuine. Therefore those churches that are nearly right, but not entirely so, are not only to consider themselves counterfeits, but more dangerous ones than those in greater error. Now imagine a sectarian putting a question or two to his opponent, as follows—"Do you believe yourselves to be entirely right in everything?" He answers, "No, I acknowledge we have some things yet to learn, and perhaps some errors to recant when discovered." "Do you think you are nearer to the truth than the other churches are?" "Yes; our studies have certainly added something to the stock of Bible knowledge that was in the world before us." "Then," replies the sectarian, "as you are not quite perfect, but nearer perfection than we are, you are the most dangerous counterfeit of all, as you will be more likely to pass for the genuine."—This would be a defeat from which there could be no recovery. There is a fallacy in the illustration. A gold coin with some alloy in it, would more fairly represent a church or a man partly in the truth and partly in error. Besides it is assumed that the counterpart depends upon its exact resemblance to the genuine for its value, rather than upon a specie basis, and that if its mere *execution* were faultless it would be intrinsically as valuable as the genuine.

Again: "Methodism is not Christianity," or, "Presbyterianism is not Christianity." These are common but unanalyzed expressions. Their truthfulness depends wholly upon the definition of the term Methodism or Presbyterianism. Methodism must mean one of three things—either the errors they hold and teach taken alone; or their errors and truths taken together, that is, their whole system of teaching, or the doctrines which distinguish them from other professors of religion—their peculiarities. Now which of these definitions is meant when we say that Methodism is not Christianity? Do we mean that their errors are not Christianity? This would be no very sagacious discovery, for nobody's errors constitute Christianity, neither theirs nor ours, and we cannot suppose any thinker would put such an ordinary statement into the language of a formal proposition. Or do we mean that their *peculiarities* do not constitute Christianity? This too would be but a tame conception requiring neither mental ability nor much biblical learning to gain it. The *distinguishing* doctrines of no protestant people on earth constitute Christianity, not even our own. The Christian church is not distinguished by their accepting the Bible as divine, for they all do the same. Nor are we distinguished by our faith in the grand facts of the gospel, in forgiveness of sins, in a heaven and a hell, nor by our faith in any of the great truths that constitute the common ground among us. To say, then, that Methodism in this sense is not Christianity is a mere platitude, for all can see that when we subtract the entire common ground from all they teach the small remnant of their theology, even if all true, would make but a sorry plan of salvation. And the same may be said of us, for the remainder after such a subtraction from all we teach would form a very cheap sort of religion. We cannot therefore suppose this to be the definition meant by those who affirm that Methodism is not Christianity. But, thirdly: does the *aggregate* of their teaching truths and errors, constitute Christianity? This is the only question in the case worthy of a good thinker. Does their per centum of error on the one hand, or their lack of truth on the other, or both these drawbacks together, discount their theology to such a degree that it cannot be called Christianity? This I will not undertake to decide but simply call the attention of our debaters to the real issue involved, and suggest the impropriety of using those meaningless platitudes usually employed by careless writers.

This position is frequently expounded as follows: Can a man be a Christian and not believe the gospel? No. Can a man be a Christian and not believe Methodism? Yes. Then Methodism is no Christianity. Now instead of this labor-saving style of argumentation, the questions should be: can a man be a Christian without be-

lieving the errors of Methodism? Yes. Can a man be a Christian without believing the peculiarities of Methodism? Yes. Then neither the errors nor peculiarities are the gospel. But can a man be a Christian without believing the aggregate of Methodism, errors and truths together? Yes, for we can spare the errors. Can he then be a Christian without believing the Bible truths the Methodists teach?—By no means, for they believe the gospel facts. Finally, *can he be a Christian by believing only the truths and errors they teach?* This is the real question in its last analysis and the only fair question, as the most moderate capacity can see.* Another number of the Harbinger may contain one or two more unsound arguments to be examined, for wa have all enjoyed their assistance long enough now to discharge them from further duty. THOMAS MUNNELL.

SKEPTICAL DIFFICULTIES.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—You have answered my "skeptical difficulties" so thoroughly, and so satisfactorily, that I have concluded to propound two or three interrogatories more, of the same character,—i. e., of a *skeptical* character.

My former queries pertained entirely to the *New* Testament; these have exclusive reference to the *Old*. Please answer in the Harbinger, and very much oblige SINCERITY.

1. Who is the author of the *Pentateuch*, commonly called the "five books of Moses"? Is Moses the author? If so, what the briefest method of proving it?

ANSWER.—Unquestionably, we answer, Moses was the author of these Books. We are not so well assured, as to what is the *briefest* method of proving it, but we will present one that is not very *long*. *First*. Our Savior ascribes these books to Moses. I need not cite all

*There is still another form of this question which, practically, sectarian systems press upon us—and that is, May not the truths they hold be so far made void by their errors of philosophy and tradition, as to call upon us earnestly to reject and oppose their *systems*, notwithstanding the truths they contain? Our Savior asked the Pharisees, "Why do ye make the law void by your traditions?"—They held the law—but destroyed its power by their traditions. Now suppose a sect holds the ordinances, and yet by their philosophy or theory of conversion, make them of no use, does not the error of the philosophy neutralize and destroy the power of the truth which is held scripturally in the ordinance, so as practically to reduce them to the position of really not holding the ordinance at all? But if we reject the philosophy, we destroy the sect. The truth remains, but on its own foundation. W. K. P.

the passages. But you will remember that, in which he raises this very question—"Did not Moses give you the law?" (Jno. 7. 19.) And again, "Beginning at Moses, and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." (Jno. 24. 27.) Now let it be remembered that at the time our Savior spoke, the expression, "the law," meant the "five books" or "pentateuch" —and "Moses," meant their author. Philip says to Nathaniel, "we have found him of whom Moses in the law, and all the prophets did write." (Jno. 1. 45) Here now is clear, positive and direct authority in proof of the proposition. And we may say it is *as strong as the evidence on which we believe in Christ.*

Second. Looking back to remoter times for proof we find the fact admitted by Ezra, and proved in various ways, about this time, beyond a cavil. Let us fix this date in round numbers, at 500 B. C. In ch. 3. 2, Ezra says Joshua, the son of Jozadak, &c., builded the altar of Israel to offer burnt offerings thereon, as *it is* written in the law of Moses, the man of God." "Sincerity" will please read, in this connection, the whole letter of Artaxerxes, ch. 7. 12, 26.

It appears from Haggai 11. 11–13, that in the 3d year of Darius, or B. C. 520, there was a copy of the law at Jerusalem. Ezra brought with him, when he came, thirty-six years afterward, another copy. (Ezra 7. 14.) Seventeen years after this Nehemiah was deputed to follow Ezra, as governor of Judea, and he also had a copy, with which he was well acquainted, and which he ascribes to Moses. (ch. 1. 7,9.) These copies all agree and are severally referred to Moses as their author. The re-laying of the foundation of the temple and the revival of the reading of the law, and the ceremonies which it enjoined, took place we are told in the presence of many of the priests and Levites and chief fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, (Ez. 1. 12) and thus the genuineness of these books is carried back to a period anterior to the captivity—say 600 years B. C.

Another step takes us back to the separation of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. Both of these divisions acknowledged the genuineness and authenticity of the Pentateuch as is proved by the incident recorded 2 Chron. 30. 1. where Hezekiah is reported as "sending to all Israel and Judah, and writing letters to Ephraim and Manasseh, that they should come to the house of the Lord at Jerusalem, to keep the passover unto the Lord God of Israel." And while many mocked a great multitude went, "and they stood in their place, after their manner, according to the law of moses, the man of God." Read the whole of this interesting chapter, 2 Chron. 30. Thus we travel back with our evidence 975 years before the Christian era; for while this incident occurred in the days of Hezekiah, it was based upon an ap-

peal to an authority which was acknowledged by both of these kingdoms at the time of their separation. Had this assumption been false, it would have of course, been treated with the rejection and contempt which it deserved.

Another step takes us back to the institution of the regal form of government over the Jews, 1095 years before Christ. The student of the Bible knows that the original civil polity of the Jews was not regal. On the contrary, it is predicted by Moses (Deut. 17. 14.), that it should become so, but as an innovation. Samuel (1 Sam. 8.) paints the calamities that should result from this change, in the fearful words of God himself. It is declared to be a rejection of God as their King. Yet the change was made—and see the argument. This same law of Moses is still recognized by these very kings. There is a change in the form of the administration, but the same law. Now this law must have existed before, or else it was originated during this regal dynasty. In the latter case, who introduced it? Clearly no private individual, or popular convention, for this would not have been allowed. But if not so, then some one of these kings. Now, besides the fact that there is positively no shadow of ground for such an assertion, Samuel, in immediate succession to whom comes Saul, the first king, inaugurates this choice of the people with the most terrible denunciations against them, because of their willfulness in desiring a king, to the rejection of God, as their ruler. Would a king, in changing the form of government, denounce the change, as deserving the wrath of God, and impose upon himself so many restrictions and limitations as we find in the 17th chapter of Deut.?—The case is simply absurd. This law of Moses that we find in authority over the kings, could not have originated with the kings, or during their reign;—therefore, it must be older than they. But this brings us within 400 years of Moses himself, and during all this period, we have one unbroken system of polity—from Samuel back to Moses. The same system of government and the same laws prevail during the whole of this period—which we have seen all along the ascending path which we have traced, to be ascribed to "Moses, the man of God."

These are a few of the arguments by which we ascend to this conclusion. We might multiply them and extend them to great length. It would take, indeed, a volume to elaborate them fully, but you ask for the briefest proof that we can give, and we must be content with this—adding simply the fact that in the Pentateuch itself, Moses is frequently alluded to as the writer. "Moses wrote their goings out, according to their journeys, by the commandments of the Lord." (Numb. 33. 2.) "Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the

priests, the sons of Levi," &c. (Deut. 31 9.) "The Lord said unto Moses, write thou these words," &c. (Exodus 34. 2.); and just at the close of the last of "the five books," it is said, "And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee.—For I know thy rebellion and thy stiff neck; behold, while I am yet alive with you this day, ye have been rebellious against the Lord; and how much more after my death." (Deut. 31. 24–27.

"2. Why is the name of Moses used in the *third person*, throughout the entire five books; as, 'The Lord spake unto Moses'—'Moses said unto them,' etc.?"

Ans.—We may not be able to give the true answer to this question, but this should be no objection to the reception of the work; for, *First*, the genuineness of the books being proved by independent evidence, the manner in which the author chooses to associate his own name with them, cannot be urged to invalidate this proof. *Second*,—The case is not singular. We know that other ancient authors and some modern, have adopted the same style. Cæsar, in his Commentaries, always speaks of himself in the *third* person; and even in our day, men when writing of themselves, are apt to use some more modest form than the big *I*. In the case before us, Moses probably regarded himself as only an agent in the hand of God, and contemplated himself, therefore, objectively in the *third person*.

"3. How could Moses write the history of his own death and burial?"

Answer.—We do not suppose that he did. The work of Moses clearly ends with the 33rd chapter. The 34th was added perhaps by Joshua, just as we find now often, a little sketch of an autobiographer, giving us an account of the few scenes, which only another person could narrate. This great and sublime work, this word of God, this ancient revelation of a special providence for the blessing of the nations, was not afraid of such quibbles as this, and did not stop to anticipate the absurd objections of the willfully skeptical. It seems to have gone upon the presumption that men could not throw away their common sense, in order to discover arguments for their folly.

W. K. P.

A man that flattereth his neighbor, spreadeth a net for his feet.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CHURCH IN DETROIT.

Resolved, That in the resignation of Elder Isaac Errett, of his pastorship of the church of Christ, meeting at the corner of Jefferson Avenue and Beaubien St., Detroit, this congregation has reasen for the most sincere and lasting regret, and that they take this occasion to testify their grateful appreciation of his faithful services on their behalf.

Resolved, That we humbly believe, that under the Diviue blessing, his labors among us during the past two years, have been rewarded by the fullest and most truly Christian success, and that through his patient and zealous efforts, our number has not only steadily grown from 17 to 110, after deducting all losses, but that also an active and earnest spirit of piety and charity has been built up in the church, and by his unremitting cheerfulness and able work, he has been for us, as always elsewhere, an efficient and honored servant of the Divine Master.

Resolved, That we will most earnestly petition the Throne of Grace that he may yet lead many sons into glory, and that his may be the path of the just, as a shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day, and that the blessing of the Lord which maketh rich and addeth no sorrow with it, may attend and rest upon him for ever.

Resolved, That we cordially extend to our beloved brother, W. T. Moore, who succeeds brother Errett in his pastoral labors in this place, our most hearty and cheerful co-operation, and we trust that with God's favor, he may be enabled to carry forward with zealous energy and abundant success, the great and important work of the upbuilding of the cause of primitive Christianity in our city, so effectually begun by our late pastor.

DOMESTIC RELIGIOUS NEWS.

New York City.—The following is a list of churches in the Metropolis, as given by the N. Y. Observer: Episcopalians, 60; Presbyterians, 56; Methodists, 38; Catholics, 32; Baptists, 29; Jews, 24; Dutch Reformed, 22; Lutheran, 9; Congregationalists, 4; Universalists, 4; Unitarians, 3; Friends, 3; Miscellaneous, 22; total, 306. Since 1845, the Roman Catholics have more than doubled their number of churches; the Jews more than trebled; the Lutherans, trebled; the Friends, Universalists, and Congregationalists have decreased, (this is significant,); the Baptists have gained 6 churches; the Methodists less than is generally supposed; the Episcopalians have outstripped the Presbyterians.

Methodists.—It is doubtless in the memory of many of our readers, that when the separation occurred in this denomination, in the great lawsuit in New York city about the division of the property, the judge referred to the absolute authority the Methodist clergy exercised in everything in their church, including property &c. The *Methodist*, an independent but powerful journal, and that has constantly advocated lay representation, in a late number says: "It is clear, also, that the tenure of the Methodist church property is entirely under the control of the General Conference. The Conference can designate who shall be trustees, how long they shall serve, and how they shall be appointed. It is reasonable, therefore, that where such important interests of the laity ars involved, the laity should be directly represented. Our churches and parsonages are now valued at twenty millions of dollars, and are increasing in value every year. Some change in the Disciplinary rules in relation to the trusteeship of Methodist church property is made at nearly every General Conference. As an instance, we may mention that the General Conference of 1864 enacted that the sale of a church "for the payment of debts, or with a view to reinvestment," shall require, in order to make it valid, the consent of the Annual Conference." So we see the conference, that is, the preachers, control even the sale of meetinghouses,—in other words as good as own them."

Methodist Missionary Contributions and Expenditures:—The *Methodist* states that at a meeting held under the auspices of the Board of Managers of the Missionary Society of the M. E. church, Nov. 14th., at New York, "Dr. Durbin, the Coresponding Secretary, gives a succinct account of the operations of the Society, and stated that the estimates which the Board made for the coming year were over six hundred and twenty-two thousand dollars. The amount of the collections for the year ending the first of November, was five hundred and fifty eight thousand dollars; and, judging from the contributions made last Sunday by a number of churches in the city, he confidently believed that the estimated sum for 1865 would be given by the church." Of this large amount the Foreign Missions receive $312,235; the remainder, $310,675, is expended in the Home Mission and the administration of the Society.

Unitarians.—The whole number of Unitarian ministers is 325; of Societies, 256. In 35 years the increase in this number has been 66—a very meagre show, giving evidence that there is but little real life in that denomination. They have 2 Theological schools, one In Cambridge, and one in Meadville, Pa., from both of which there were last year but 8 graduates.

GOOD WORDS FROM OUR CORRESPONDENTS.

BALTIMORE CO., MD., FEB. 10TH, 1865.

BRO. PENDLETON:—A brief statement of the labors of Bro. D. S. Burnet in Baltimore, may not be without interest to many of the readers of the "Harbinger."

The account of his stewardship rendered to the church ending with the first ecclesiastical year, contains sufficient to justify them in thinking themselves most fortunate in securing his labors.

The number of additions by baptism and otherwise, one hundred and eight —a small proportion of these to other churches.

The personal labor has been immense; few can form any just idea of the work performed under the circumstances to consummate the happy results which at this moment animate and encourage the brethren.

The number of social or pastoral visitations alone would seem enough for one man, scattered as they must be over an area of such immense extent—*one* place of worship for a population of three hundred thousand, and the membership numbering some three hundred and fifty, scattered to the most distant points of the city. To accomplish the task of something over *seventeen hundred* pastoral visitations, and meet all the other demands upon his time, still additional to the labor of meeting public expectation in the preparation and delivery of from one to two hundred discourses, all within the space of a single year, is an amount of labor which few men perform. This, too, while passing through a fiery trial, common to all the churches, especially those of the border States,—where the pressure from without has been fearful, but so far all has been peace within.

Meanwhile some of our churches in the vicinity of the "Queen City," and elsewhere, are taking advantage of Paul's advice "to covet earnestly the best gifts," and somewhat at our expense, are as earnestly coveting the *best Preachers*. But as this is a sword of two edges, we had better be wary of its handling.

Affectionately, GEO. AUSTEN.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., FEB. 8TH, 1865.

BRO. PENDLETON:—During the months of November and December last, I visited six congregations in Knox county, Indiana, and gave them sixty-five discourses, and there were 41 additions to the churches, mostly by faith, repentance and immersion; the others had been immersed. Bros. J. K. and W. Speer and Treat were with me part of the time, and did good service in the work of the Lord. I think that the seven weeks in Knox county were as happily and profitably employed as any seven weeks of my life. I think that I am as able and willing to work for the Lord now, as at any former period of my life. To God, through our Lord, be all the praise for his great goodness. As ever, your brother in the work of the Lord, J. B. NEW.

☞ It should be remembered that this veteran laborer is now over 70 years of age. W. K. P.

BRO. PENDLETON:—The meetings held by Bro. W. B. Hendryx, in Berlin, have resulted in *ninety* additions.

I am at present assisting in a series of meetings at Ionia. Thus far we have had *ten* additions, and a fine interest. Bro. J. H. Jones, of Ohio, gladdened the brethren at Muir and Ionia with his presence and labors for a few days.—He is the same indefatigable and powerful pleader that we knew twenty years ago—only more mellowed in tone and feeling, by increasing years.

Bro. Eli Regal, though for the present resting from active duties in the evangelical field, is the same faithful and devoted soldier of the cross. He has performed much hard and successful labor in this region—and although the necessary demands of business have compelled him to ask a furlough, for a time, from field duty—we hope soon to see him in circumstances where his valuable services will be given again, without embarrassment, to the cause to which he has given the greater part of his life, in unostentatious but effective labors.

MUIR, MICH., Feb. 6, 1865. I. E.

P. S. I have just finished (Feb. 20th) three weeks' labor at Ionia, with 33 additions. Bro. Hendryx continues the meeting. I start for New Castle, Pa.

I. E.

INDIANA "MISSION."

BRO. PENDLETON:—Permit me through your excellent monthly to remind the brotherhood that the "Missionaries" are abroad, sowing the good seed of the kingdom. Much of the precious seed is falling upon good ground, and producing fruits to the honor and glory of God. The brethren in our State are in earnest, and as the fruits of their earnestness, I am glad to report the labors of brethren Henry, Campbell, Patterson, Jennings, Adamson, Buchannan, Lockhart, Grigsby, O'Kane, Wilson, Ridge, Smith, Taylor, Franklin, Sherman, McPherson, Winfield, Bartlett, Hadsell, Ward, Leonard, Winter, and McIllvaine, resulting (during the last quarter) in 419 additions to the church—327 by confession and baptism. The last month's receipts for our mission have been near -600 in cash. May all our brethren, by the love of God and the interests of the perishing thousands arond us, be induced to aid in the great co-operative effort which is now being made to firmly establish the good cause from the rivers to the ends of the earth. All donations sent to me, Box 282, Indianapolis, will be properly credited and receipted for. Pray for us, brethren.

In hope and love, R. L. HOWE, Cor. Sec.

SAINT LOUIS, Mo. Feb. 4th, 1865.

BRO. PENDLETON:— * * * * I am happy to report our congregation in a very flourishing condition—audiences large—the house generally full—with accessions almost every Lord's day.

In the past year we have paid off our old indebtedness of over *ten thousand dollars*, and our "*den*" is now no longer covered by a mortgage.

In this action we have not asked permission of our editorial brethren, and may have acted in "defiant disregard" of their "*views*." Should we find this to be the case, we should be willing to refer the matter to some "regularly constituted body of the *ministry*," and thus propitiate them.

Fraternally yours, J. O. CARSAN.

Bro. J. W. McGarvey, in a letter dated Lexington, Ky., Feb. 1st, '65, says: "Bro. T. M. Allen is with us holding a meeting. He is now in the third week, and has had 12 confessions. The prospects are good for more."

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 36.] BETHANY, W. V., *APRIL*, 1865. [No. IV.

THE CONVERSION OF PAUL.

This has been a theme of much mysticism, and one which, therefore, deserves a calm and thorough analysis. We wish to see what there is in the narrative of the conversion of Paul, that is common to all conversions, and what there is that is peculiar to this case alone, or to this as belonging to a small class only, of which it is an example. In the beginning, it might be well to throw out some cautions against the undue bias of prepossessions as to the miraculous features of this case; but we shall trust, rather, to the light of the analysis itself to remove all these, as we proceed.

It is quite important, in the outset, to place fairly before our minds some of the peculiarities of character and circumstance of this wonderful man; because the divine Providence is always regulated in its development, by the nature of the case with which it has to deal.

1. Paul was an educated man. He had been brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, one of the most learned of the Doctors of the law, and besides being thus thoroughly instructed in the principles of the Jewish dispensation, he was also conversant, as is evident from his style and allusions in his speeches and writings, with the literature of the Greeks.

2. He was a genuinely honest man. After his conversion and when he had come to despise his former life, he emphatically declares that he acted in all good conscience, thinking that he was performing a high service to the God, whom, according to the religion of his fathers, he devoutly worshiped.

3. He was a man of most ardent and enthusiastic disposition.—

His zeal burned with a flame that knew no quenching. Fed by a faith that never doubted, and nerved by a courage that never quailed, he stood forth, the valiant champion of whatever cause he espoused, with a devotion that accepted no compromise, and shrunk from no consequences.

4. Still more important to be considered is the fact that Paul was a devout worshiper of the only true and living God. After the strictest sect of the Jews' religion, he lived a Pharisee. He believed in God, acknowledged his authority, and served him, as he thought, with a persecuting zeal that had no parallel in his time.

Learned and honest and enthusiastic and pious, why was he not a Christian? Simply because he did not believe in Christ. He honestly thought him a blasphemous pretender—and therefore, with all the fiery ardor of his honest and pious nature, he persecuted, as the enemies of the God whom he worshiped, wherever he found them, the preachers of the Cross. From the humble and timid woman, who lifted her trembling heart up in trust to the bleeding Lamb, to the unquailing man-martyr, whom he encountered in the triumphant Stephen, his voice was raised and his hand stretched forth for persecution. He entered into private houses, and, dragging the unresisting followers of Christ from their firesides, thrust them into prisons; surprising them in their assemblies, he hushed the voice of their praise and made "havoc of the church." "He scourged them often in every synagogue"—and sought even to make them curse the name of Him in whom they trusted for eternal life. In his own bitter words, uttered after his conversion, he "persecuted the church of God and wasted it." A "blasphemer, a persecutor, and injurious," he felt, oh how bitterly! that "he was not meet to be called an apostle."

It is evident that such a man as this, needed only to know his duty, to do it. He was not in spirit an infidel or a skeptic, but a man that believed in God and was zealous in his service according to his knowledge. But he was ignorant; and through ignorance, in unbelief. It cannot be said that Paul was, at heart, a bad man. On the contrary, he was, according to the law, a true man of God. He treated the followers of Christ just as he thought the law required him to treat them. And as he was ready to persecute Christ, because he thought he was a blasphemer, so we shall find him equally ready to serve him, so soon as he is convinced that he is the Son of God.—There was no sham about this noble Tarsian; but we find him rather, one of the most genuine and earnest of men. We do not discover that he ever confounds good and evil. He does not claim that his conduct was *right*, because it was *sincere*. He reprobates the false and the wrong, with a severity all the more intense, it seems, because

he discovered them in his own past life. He looks upon error as essentially evil, and sincerity, not a justification, but only a palliation, to open the door for mercy. With all his self-sacrificing sincerity, he knows himself to be the chief of sinners; and in view of the enormity of the crimes which he had perpetrated, he is overwhelmed at the mercy which, rising on gentle wing above them all, can save even him. "Assuredly," he cries, "true and worthy of all acceptation is this saying: that Christ came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief."

Such is the man first introduced to our notice in connection with the martyrdom of Stephen. All that is said of him here is, that the clothes of the witnesses against Stephen were laid at this young man's feet, and that he was well pleased with his death. But it is impossible that such an exhibition of sublime piety and faith could have been wittnessed by such a nature as Saul's without producing a profound and indelible impression upon his mind. He had heard the speech of Stephen to the close, and by his education in the law, was well qualified to appreciate its argument. The fearful accusations which Stephen hurled like thunderbolts at his persecutors, drawn as they were from the veritable history of the past, must have worked with peculiar power in the mind of this highly educated young man. The familiarity which Stephen manifested with the history of the Jewish nation, his wonderful art of grouping into a few paragraphs the great outlines of that history, and the original power with which he struck out the keynote of its wonderful spiritual harmony, must have awakened in Paul new and strange reflections; for he had long been a devout student of these writings, and here was a divine light thrown upon them, calculated to reveal to him new and wondrous things, such as he had not seen before. Add to this the heroic death of the Proto-martyr. Think of a man enthusiastic and pious, who verily believed he was doing God's service, listening to a speech like Stephen's, and then imagine him looking upon the sublime confidence of his faith, as, lifting his countenance all radiant with the vision of the glory of God, earnestly up towards the heavens, he exclaimed, "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing at the right hand of God"; and then, commending his spirtt to Christ and kneeling calmly down for his death, utter that tender yet loud intercession for his murderers, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge!" What must Paul think of all this! That it would move him deeply, can scarcely be denied; and that it should excite him to a thoughtful consideration of the mystery of that power which sustained the martyr in his heroic death, is a probability at once natnral and evident.—He consented to his death, because he sincerely thought that, accord-

ing to the law, he ought to die; but doubtless the sublime moral spectacle of his constancy and love, was working an impression upon his heart that could never be effaced.

It has long been thought by many of those who have meditated most upon this case, that Paul's heart was here for the first time challenged to think upon the probable error of his course. Vicente Joannes, a celebrated Spanish painter, we are told, "in a picture of Stephen conducted to the place of execution, has represented Saul as walking by the martyr's side with melancholy calmness. He consents to his death from a sincere though mistaken conviction of duty; and the expression of his countenance is strongly contrasted with the rage of the baffled Jewish Doctors, and the ferocity of the crowd who flock to the scene of bloodshed. * * * But the picture, though historically incorrect, is poetically true. The painter has worked according to the true idea of his art, in throwing upon the persecutor's countenance the shadow of his coming repentance. We cannot dissociate the martyrdom of Stephen from the conversion of Paul."*— In the language of Augustine,

Si Stephanus non orasset
Ecclesia Paulum non haberet.

Literally rendered,

"If Stephen had not have prayed,
The church Paul would not have had."

This supposition presents us with no uncommon case. Thousands were brought to inquire into the power of this new life, by watching its triumphs over death in the persons of the martyrs, and thus owe their first movements towards conversion to this form of testimony. "The ashes of the martyrs became the seed of the church."

We are thus particular to notice these facts, because they help to place before us the true state of the man, the process of whose conversion we are attempting to understand. We are told, indeed, that he was "still breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord," but this conflict of feeling which we are supposing to have already commenced in his heart, is not incompatible with this fact. On the contrary, it helps to explain it; for Paul would naturally regard these misgivings as the weakness of a heart too ready to shrink from the stern duties of the law, and nerve himself all the harder for his bloody tasks. Sympathy with Stephen he would regard as treachery to God, and in proportion as conviction vascillated, would passion rage. Naturally, then, he "went to the chief priest, and asked of him letters to Damascus, for the synagogues,

* Life of Paul, by Con. & Hows., p. 75.

that if he should find any who were of this persuasion, either man or woman, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem."

And now behold Saul thus commissioned, on his journey from Jerusalem to Damascus. There are many things about this journey, and the nature of Paul's commission, that we would like to know, but of which the New Testament says never a word. He went forth armed with the authority of the great Sanhedrim. This extended over the Jew in all religious questions, no matter where he might be found; and as there were many Jews at Damascus, the persecutors naturally hoped to catch a rich supply of victims for their yet unsated appetite for vengeance. But how Paul traveled, what road he took, and what was the number of his retinue, we are not told. There were men journeying with him, we are told, but whether appointed to accompany him, or merely accidental companions of the way, we are not informed. The probability is that they were appointed to accompany him by the Sanhedrim, as a sort of *posse comitatus*, to assist in the arrest and transfer to Jerusalem of such victims as Paul might catch at Damascus. In some of our Bibles we have pictures of Paul falling from a horse, smitten to the earth by the Holy Spirit; and doubtless many a venturous guess of theology has sprung from these pictures. But we know of nothing more gratuitous, since, as we shall see, there is not only not a word said about Paul's being on horseback, but the Holy Spirit also is not once introduced in the whole narrative of Paul's conversion!

To this narrative, then, let us turn our attention. It is three times given in the New Testament—once by Luke (Acts ix.), and twice by Paul himself;—once in the 22d chapter of Acts, when he harangued his countrymen from the steps of the fortress in the city of Jerusalem, just after he had been rescued from the violence of a mob—and again in the 26th of Acts, when he made his ever memorable defense before Agrippa. If we may judge of its importance by the space which this narrative holds on the pages of the New Testament, but few events in all that record can be cited to surpass it.

The journey from Jerusalem to Damascus was nearly completed.—For near one hundred and fifty miles he had toiled through the weary stage, and now he stands in sight of the distant city. "Among the rocks and brushwood," says Howson, "at the base of Antilibanus are the fountains of a copious and perennial stream, which, after running a course of no great distance to the south-east, loses itself in a desert lake. But before it reaches this dreary boundary, it has distributed its channels over the intermediate space, and left a wide area behind it, rich with prolific vegetation. These are the 'streams

from Lebanon,' which are known to us in the imagery of Scripture;*—the 'rivers of Damascus,' which Naaman not unnaturally preferred to all the 'waters of Israel.'† By Greek writers the stream is called Chrysorrhoas,‡ or the 'river of gold.' And this stream is the inestimable treasure of Damascus. The habitations of men must always have been gathered around it, as the Nile has inevitably attracted an immemorial population to its banks. The desert is a fortification round Damascus. The river is its life. It is drawn out into watercourses, and spread in all directions. For miles around it is a wilderness of gardens,—gardens with roses among the tangled shrubberies, and with fruit on the branches overhead. Everywhere among the trees the murmur of unseen rivulets is heard. Even in the city, which is in the midst of the garden, the clear rushing of the current is a perpetual refreshment. Every dwelling has its fountain: and at night, when the sun has set behind Mount Lebanon, the lights of the city are seen flashing on the waters.

"It is not to be wondered at that the view of Damascus, when the dim outline of the gardens has become distinct, and the city is seen gleaming white in the midst of them, should be universally famous. All travelers in all ages have paused to feast their eyes with the prospect; and the prospect has been always the same. It is true that in the Apostle's day there were no cupolas and no minarets: Justinian had not built St. Sophia, and the caliphs had erected no mosques.—But the white buildings of the city gleamed then, as they do now, in the center of a verdant inexhaustible paradise. The Syrian gardens, with their low walls and waterwheels, and careless mixture of fruits and flowers, were the same then as they are now. The same figures would be seen in the green approaches to the town, camels and mules, horses and asses, with Syrian peasants, and Arabs from beyond Palmyra. We know the very time of the day when Saul was entering these shady avenues. It was at mid-day,§ the birds were silent in the trees. The hush of noon was in the city. The sun was burning fiercely in the sky. The persecutor's companions were enjoying the cool refreshment of the shade after their journey: and his eyes rested with satisfaction on those walls which were the end of his mission, and contained the victims of his righteous zeal."

Such was the scene before Saul, and here the new-born peace of the Christian life, that had sprung up in this renowned city, was to be broken by this persecuting minister of the Sanhedrim;—but before

---

* Song of Sol. iv. 15. † 2 Kings v. 12.

‡ Strabo, xvi. 2. Ptolem. v. 15, 9. See Plin. H. N. v. 16

§ Acts xxii. 6, xxvi. 13.

that hour comes, another sight bursts upon his vision, and when again he looks upon these golden waters, it is to be buried with Him whom he had persecuted, in the liquid grave of baptism. We will look narrowly at these facts. "Suddenly, at mid-day," says he, "there shone from heaven a great light, above the brightness of the sun, round about me and those who journeyed with me. And when we had all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice speaking to me, and saying, in the Hebrew language, Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me? It is hard for you to kick against the goads. And I said, Who art thou, Lord? He replied, I am Jesus the Nazarene, whom you persecute. But arise and stand upon your feet. They who came with me saw the light and were afraid, but did not understand the voice of him who spoke to me. And I said, What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said to me, Arise and go into Damascus, and there you shall be told of all things that are appointed for you to do. And as I could not see for the glory of that light, I was led by the hand by those that were with me, and went into Damascus. And one Ananias, a devout man according to the law, who had a good report from all the Jews that dwelt there, came to me, and standing by me, said, Brother Saul, receive your sight. And the same hour I looked upon him. And he said, The God of our fathers has chosen you, that you should know his will, and see the Just One, and hear the voice of his mouth; for you shall be his witness to all men of what you have seen and heard.—And now, why do you delay? Arise, and be immersed, and wash away your sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." (Acts 22.)

These are the main facts in the case. In the *first* place, we notice this significant feature with respect to them:—that is, that the Holy Spirit is not once mentioned in the whole narrative. Look closely at every word, reader, and consider its meaning, and test for yourself the correctness of my statement. We deny that the Holy Spirit is mentioned in any word or sentence of this whole account—not in any version of it. This can be tested by a simple inspection. Look at the text in any translation, or in the original, and you will not find this word. More than this. We deny that anything recorded in the narrative was done by the *personal agency* of the Holy Spirit. The "great light from heaven" was simply a physical miracle, wrought like all the other miracles which our Savior performed—by himself in person; and so far as we distinguish the proper personal acts of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit at all, was clearly not referable to the agency of either the Father or the Holy Spirit. And this is important, because it preserves the harmony of the gospel system. The Holy Spirit is never represented as appearing to any person in the exercise of direct miraculous power upon him for his conversion.

If it had been so in this case, we would be presented with an anomaly as great as if, in nature, gravity should take the place of heat, or, in government, the executive assume the legitimate function of the legislative. In a certain high and sublime sense, whatever the Son does the Father also does. They are one—and he is but a shallow thinker who *excludes* the Holy Spirit from any act of the Father or the Son;—but in the revelation which we call the Christian system, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are not more clearly distinguished in name, than in the work which is assigned, by the concurrent counsel of the three, to each distinctively. As, therefore, in harmony with this system, the Holy Spirit never appears as the direct and immediate agent in working miracles for the conversion of men, it would have been a violation of this law of the system for Him to have been introduced as the Agent in this case.

But some will say, Was it not through the power of the Holy Spirit that the apostles performed the miracles which they wrought? We answer, yes. But these miracles were not personal influences wrought directly by the Holy Spirit upon the parties to be converted, but manifestations of supernatural power in the persons of the apostles, in proof of their mission. To the eyes of the people who saw these miracles, they were the immediate acts of the apostles by whose agency they were wrought. If the people saw in these miracles anything more than the agency of the apostles, it was only through the indirect process of an inference, or by faith in the statements of the apostles themselves;—the Holy Spirit did not appear in and could not be known *directly* through the miracle.

A proper consideration of this invariable law of the Christian system, will not only enable us to dissipate many a delusion concerning the influence of the Spirit in the work of conversion, as it is mystified in the present day, but help us also to understand more correctly the case of Paul.

Returning then to this feature of the case, we ascertain the "great light" to be simply a physical miracle. Its direct effect was the same upon Saul and his companions. *They all fell to the earth.* In the pictures to which we have referred, Paul is represented as violently dashed from his horse, as by a physical force, like a flash of lightning or a thunderbolt. But in this representation, we have not only the unwarranted assumption of a horse in the case, but a mistake, we think, also as to the cause of Paul's falling to the earth. It is not said that he *was stricken* to the earth, as by a physical force, but that he fell to the ground. *Epeson te eis to edaphos* (επεσον τε εις το εδαφος), "*I fell to the ground*," says Paul. This word *pipto* (πιπτω) occurs frequently in the Scriptures, as expressive of an action of worship;—

also as an expression of fear. This latter was probably the effect here. This sudden splendor, surpassing the noonday brightness of a Syrian sun, was well calculated to alarm them. The case is precisely parallel to that reported in the account of the transfiguration.—There, a "bright cloud overshadowed them, and lo, a voice from the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I delight: hear him. And when the disciples heard it, they fell on their faces and were greatly afraid. And Jesus came and touched them, and said, Arise and be not afraid." (Matt. xvii. 5, 6.)

In respect of the miracle, then, there was nothing peculiar to Saul. All witnessed it, and all were similarly affected by it. *It excited them all with fear.*

The next point in the development, which demands our attention, is the "voice" that was heard. It seems they all heard the *noise* of a voice, but only Saul *understood* what was said. Little critics are fond of regaling their skepticism by a fancied discrepancy in the different narratives here; but we can allow them no comfort save at the expense of their sagacity. It is an admitted and constantly applied principle of interpretation, as to both sacred and profane compositions, that a charge of contradiction is not to be made, if any plausible way of reconciling two or several statements can be pointed out. If in one statement it is said, "they heard nothing, but only saw the light," and in another, "they heard the voice, but saw no man," we have only to suppose that in the first case, *hear* is used in the very common sense of "*understand*"; and in the second case, in its literal sense of simply experiencing the sensation of sound. The two statements together, then, will mean, that they heard the sound of a voice, but did not understand what was said. This fact may be explained in two ways. The language, being Hebrew, may have been strange to them, or, Paul may have been at some distance from them at the time, and words distinctly intelligible to his ear, may have reached his companions only as confused sounds.

As to the second discrepancy, in which Luke represents the men as *standing amazed*, and Paul says *they fell to the earth*, it is scarcely worth a reply; for we may either understand the expression "stood amazed," as equal to riveted to the spot, or arrested in their progress, by amazement, without intending to describe any precise posture of the body,—or we may understand the two narratives as referring to two different instants of time. Thus, suppose at the first moment of the "great light" they all fell; but the men not being further affected, soon rose up, and stood upon their feet, while Jesus conversed with Saul, who still remained prostrate upon the earth. Either of these

very plausible suppositions answers the demands of the critical canon by which the narrative must be tried—and we pass on.

This voice was addressed to Saul. It said, in Hebrew, "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me? It is hard for you to kick against the goads." These are veritable words—addressed to the understanding, and challenging Saul to reason with Him whom he persecuted. His response indicates that Saul knew the speaker to be divine:—"Who art thou, Lord?" This he knew by the miracle, but it does not appear that Saul, as yet, felt assured that it was Jesus.—That his conscience, already no doubt troubled by the sublime specele of Stephen's constancy and faith, would suggest the thought that it might be Jesus, is highly probable; yet such a man is not to be converted upon a perhaps—a conjecture—it might be off ear. He wants assurance, and this is given him in the reply: "I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom you persecute. It is hard for you to kick against the goads." By the miracle, Saul knew the speaker to be a divine messenger, and therefore to be trusted and obeyed; and by the answer to his question, he next becomes convinced that he is the very Jesus whom he was persecuting in the persons of his followers. This brings us, then, to that stage of Saul's conversion in which he is first brought to believe in Jesus; and we see that this conviction came by hearing.—Saul's faith, then, is produced like every other man's faith, by the evidence of miracles and the word of God. Up to this moment Saul is the bitter and relentless persecutor of Jesus, but ignorantly and in unbelief; but now, he discovers his mistake. He can doubt no longer; and in harmony with the high integrity and honesty of his nature, he is ready at once to reform—to abandon his persecution—to submit himself to the authority that he had despised, and which he had compelled others to blaspheme. He has no word left, but Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? What has wrought this wondrous change? Does any one say, it was a special and mysterious work of the Holy Spirit, miraculously applied to his heart. We reply, that the narrative does not so teach us. It was the effect of *miraculously attested words* addressed to his understanding through his ear, just as they come to you, reader, or any other man who believes. Every man who has the New Testament, has the same kind of testimony, and the same verbal revelation concerning Jesus. Saul had these directly from Christ himself; we have them also from him, through others divinely commissioned to deliver them to us. In Saul, they fell upon a noble heart—one that feared God, and who was prepared and ready to do his will, as fast as he discovered what it might be. In his own language—"He was not disobedient to the heavenly vision."

Up to this stage, we inquire, what was there peculiar in the case

of Saul? We answer, As to the *nature* or *kind* of means employed, there was really no influence that is not exerted, *in kind*, in every conversion. *The testimony of miracles confirming the word spoken*, in one short sentence, comprehends it all. In the language of Hebrews, it is the same "great salvation, which at first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed to us by those who heard him; God also bearing testimony with them by signs and wonders, and by various mighty deeds, and by distribution of the Holy Spirit, according to his own will." (Heb. ii. 3, 4.) The only peculiar feature, is the personal appearance of the Savior.

Thus we see that so far as the faith of Saul is concerned, there was a direct application of the ordinary means of the gospel, but beyond the fact of the personal appearance of the Lord Jesus, whom he did not know, save upon his own statement, there was no influence that is not virtually at work to-day, wherever the testimony of the apostles is heard and the gospel is faithfully preached. Jesus preached himself, the Christ, to Saul,—the apostles preach Jesus, the Christ to us. Jesus confirmed his own word by a miracle,—the apostles confirm theirs by the same infallible sign. Saul saw, and conversed personally with Jesus; this is an honor to which we are not admitted. Is it essential to conversion? No one will say so. What then was the design of it? The scriptures are plain. They tell us it was to make him an apostle. "The God of our fathers," says Ananias, "has chosen you, that you should know his will, and see the Just One, and hear the voice of his mouth, for you shall be his witness to all men, of what you have seen and heard." Paul was a worshipper of the "God of our fathers" already, and here is a new work, which he calls upon him to do, requiring, as a special qualification that he should first see the Lord.

But we anticipate our narrative, The bright vision left him blind. He is led as a helpless child into the city, whose Christian life he was about to invade with the havoc of his persecution. He had been the Lord,—had heard his voice in distinct and specific command,—had been convinced that the Jesus whom he had persecuted was the Christ the Son of the living God:—but how had all this left him?—Blind and penitent! Oppressed with the overwhelming grief of his fearful situation, he neither ate nor drank for three dark and dreary days of sad and anxious repentance. Fasting and prayer both belonged to the religion of the; Jews and Saul, ignorant of what he should do, waiting, according to orders, for the promised information, naturally resorted to these means of getting relief to his burthened conscience. The goads were piercing him to the deep, and he felt that he could only believe and wait. Neither his praying nor his fasting

brought him any peace. The order of the gospel dispensation had been established, and it could not be violated, even in the case of Saul. The sense of the remission of sins is to be given only through baptism, and this Saul must know in his own experience; and for this, though he does not understand it, he is now waiting. After all, the human preacher must intervene and be honored as the minister of this grace, before Saul can feel the answer of a good conscience. The Savior will not alter the means by which his message of mercy is to be brought home to the hearts of men, even for this chosen vessel. To make him an apostle and fit him for the great and special work of his messenger of the gospel to the Gentiles, he will appear to him—speak to and convince him of his might and authority, but he will not give him a sense of the pardon of his sins or tell him directly how he may get it, save in harmony with the commission which he had given to the apostles, just before his glorious ascension to his throne. Saul must be baptized, and this condition of pardon he must hear and receive from Ananias. And it is beautiful to see how submissive this proud persecutor has become! Like a little child, this learned disciple of Gamaliel,—the honored agent of the great Sanhedrim, bows himself under the hand of an obscure private of that same Jesus he was just now persecuting; and one of the helpless ones that he came to punish, is acknowledged as the bearer of a message of pardon and peace to his own soul, from the despised Nazarene.

Our space will not allow us to prosecute this inquiry any farther. Our main object, however, is already accomplished. We see that in Saul's case, two things were to be accomplished. 1st. His conversion. 2nd. His preparation for apostleship. His conversion was effected like all other men's, through faith, repentance, and baptism; and he was brought to these, just as other men are—by the preaching of the word, with the confirmation of miracles. His preparation for the apostleship was also like that of the other apostles—through direct revelation of the person and will of the Lord. So that he could say, "Have I not seen the Lord Jesus," and claim to speak by original commission from him, without the necessity of conference with, or instruction from the other apostles.

Let us therefore lift this case out of the mysticism by which it has been so long confused, and in the light of a clear analysis, make it a strong confirmation of the unbroken harmony of the Christian system, and another proof, that the way of this great salvation is, to all and for all, the same, and so plain that even the simple wayfarer need not err therein. W. K. P.

He that soweth iniquity shall reap vanity."

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY.

The New Testament is a Message from God, addressed to every Individual of the Human Race.

Readers of the Harbinger:—Allow me to appropriate some reflections of Francis Wayland's, and convert them into the form of an essay bearing upon the above subject.

I think it obvious that the New Testament is a message from God, addressed not to nations, or societies, or masses, or to any ecclesiastical caste, but to every individual of the human race. It treats of the relations which every one of us holds to God, and of the duties which He requires of every one of us personally. Every one of us must give an account *for himself* unto God. The duties which the New Testament imposes must be performed, not by the votes of the masses, but by the acts of the individual, not by representatives, but by each man for himself. Moral obligation is in its nature intransferable, and it is of moral obligation exclusively, that the Word of God treats. It tells us of the duties we owe to our Creator and Redeemer, and these duties can never be performed by substitutes. So far as I know, this rule applies to every precept taught by Jesus Christ. What could be more absurd than to suppose ourselves at liberty to lie or steal if we only procured some one else to be honest and tell the truth for us. Does not the same principle apply equally to all the other precepts of the gospel? Do we keep the law or break it?

Let us turn for a moment to the views which prevail in most of the churches of every denomination. There can, I think, be no doubt that the Savior requires every redeemed soul to make the extension of the kingdom of Christ the great business of his life, to labor personally with men for their salvation, to invite them to come to Christ that they may escape the wrath to come. There cannot, then, be a disciple of Christ, whatever be his condition, on whom this obligation in all its strictness does not plainly rest. But how do we perform this duty? We form ourselves into churches, delegate the labor of extending the kingdom of Christ to a single individual, and consider ourselves absolved from the duty imposed upon us by simply ministering to his physical wants. The Master summons us all to perform labor in his vineyard, and we combine together and send, in the place of several hundreds, a single individual. To render our conduct consistent, we prescribe qualifications for the discharge of a Christian duty which Christ has never prescribed, and then excuse ourselves from doing his bidding because we have not these self-im-

posed qualifications. We seem to suppose that no disciple is at liberty to invite sinners to come to Christ unless he has consumed many years in the study of heathen classics, and become familiar with the opinions of men for eighteen centuries on the teachings of Christ. It required the wisdom of Omniscience to express the ideas of God in the words o fJesus so simply that a little child can understand them. We assume that these very teachings are, of all writings on earth, the most enigmatical, nay, that they are in fact committed to a learned priesthood, who are authorized to interpret them to us. But this learned caste seem to find almost as much difficulty in understanding the revelation as their less favored brethren. They open the book and spread over it a covering of the opinions of the so-called fathers, and over this another from the logomachy of the schoolmen, and over this another from the polemics of the Reformation, and over this another from the metaphysical divinity of a later age, and over these, last of all, a thick vail of German neology, and then they wonder that through all these, they cannot decipher the letters of light traced by the finger of God manifest in the flesh. Thus the vision is become unto us as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this I pray thee, and he saith, I cannot, for it is sealed; and the book is delivered unto one that is not learned, saying, Read this I pray thee, and he saith, I cannot for I am not learned. Thus, to escape the obligation of personal duty, we make the Word of God of none effect, we deny the right of private interpretation, and are thoughtlessly embracing one of the most fatal errors of Romanism.

The same tendency to do the will of God by substitute, instead of doing it each one for himself, may be observed in our attempts to accomplish some good design, or to arreat the progress of some enormous evil. Christ commands every one of us, individually, to follow his example, and, laying hold of the weapons of faith and love, with holy boldness commence the warfare against every form of vice and oppression. It is on the efforts of single men, moved by a common love of Christ, and guided by the indwelling spirit, that the gospel relies for success. We, however, take a different course.—Instead of commencing this labor, each one for himself, we prefer to merge our individuality in extensive voluntary associations. We meet in conventions, we deliver platform orations, we pass strong resolutions, and we return home well pleased with the belief that, though we have not reformed a single sinner, we have made a powerful impression on what we term the American mind. In this conviction we remain perfectly at ease until the next anniversary, when we meet again, make speeches, pass resolutions, talk vehemently about the all-

controlling moral efficacy of the ballot-box, and, although we have not touched the burden with one of our fingers, wonder that the work of reformation is not already accomplished. We proceed in the same manner in the matter of ordinary benevolence. Jesus Christ has made it the duty of every one of his disciples to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to visit the sick and the prisoner, to speak words of comfort to the disconsolate, and to carry the good news of salvation to publicans and sinners, the lost, the forgotten, and the abandoned, and he has said, Inasmuch as ye have done it to the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. He has taught us that personal labor in these forms of charity is a means of spiritual improvement, just like prayer or fasting; he has subjected it to the same rules, and promised to it the same rewards. How do we obey this precept? We form a Society to which each member contributes a miserable mite, and thus a sum is annually collected no greater than that which many of these individuals expend in thoughtless extravagance. We employ an agent to distribute these little offerings, and never ourselves come into personal contact with poverty, wretchedness, and crime. Thus the work of charity is, as we suppose, adequately, as it certainly is economically performed. It costs no sacrifice. It cultivates the Christian graces neither of the benefactor nor the recipient. In all this, do we keep or break the commandment of the Redeemer?

Before I close, suffer me to add a remark respectng missions. The command of the Savior to his disciples, is, Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. To fulfill this command is the very object for which the church of Christ was constituted, andt for which each individual Christian lives. For himself and for his fellow-men he seeks first the kingdom of heaven. To this object the plans of his life should be subordinated. Every disciple of Chris. should hold himself ready, at all times, to spend his life in any place where he can the most succesfully labor for the conversion of souls With these views I do not see why a Christian merchant, or mechanic, or physician, is not bound, just as much as a minister of ths gospel, to ask, is it the will of the Master that I shall serve him in a heathen or in a Christian land? The cause of Christ requires the aid of all men of every calling. Men of the world go to the heathen lands by thousands for the sake of gain; why should not Christian laymen accompany them and labor to rescue souls from perdition?— The heathen are corrupted by the example of ungodly civilized men why should not their unholy influence be corrected by the precept and example of godly men? Or, if the Christian layman believes it to be his duty to remain at home, the principles which govern his life, are not on that account in any manner changed. He accumu-

lates not for himself but for others, and all that he possesses is to be consecrated in simplicity of heart to the advancement of the kingdom of Christ.

But how do we obey the injunctions of the Master? We form associations for the purpose of extending the kingdom of Christ at home and abroad, we devolve upon a few of our brethren the labor of superintending the work, and suppose that our duty is performed by simply making a contribution to this form of charity. This contribution, however, is too small to occasion the self-denial of the most insignificant luxury. We send a few missionaries abroad, and a few to our own destitute settlements. But let me ask, at our present rate of self denying efforts, what millions of years must elapse before the kingdoms of the world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ? Are we in this matter obeying or breaking the commandment of the Master?

I need not multiply illustrations. Suppose, however, a visitor from another sphere, acquainted with all that has been done for the salvation of man, and knowing the infinite consequences which result from keeping or breaking the commandments of Jesus, should visit our world, pass through our marts of business, enter our families, frequent our places of amusement, go with us to our magnificent temples and make himself familiar with the vice and misery festering everywhere around us, where would he look for the disciples of the holy, self-denying Son of God? If we make obedience to the commands of Jesus the foundation of his judgments, would he not decide that the love of the Father was hardly to be discovered among us? But beloved, there is such a visitor ever present with us, whose word is quick and powerful, sharper than a two edged sword, and a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. He said not a word, when he was on earth, which did not express the unchangeable law of the eternal God. That law is as great and powerful now as at the moment when he uttered it. He has said, unless a man deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me he cannot be my disciple. In vain do ye call me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. The law of Christian discipleship has not changed, for Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever. Awake, thou that sleepest, arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee life.

Nor is this all. When we break the commandments of Christ we of necessity teach men so. We are set forth before the world as the living exponents of the precepts of Christ, and men understand them to mean whatever they see us actually doing. Hence the young convert, misled by our example, quickly forsakes his first love and sinks

his religion into a thing of creeds and formulas and outward professions. The impenitent ask us, what is the change which we insist upon as necessary to salvation, since the men who have passed through it are no better than themselves? They hear from the pulpit much about human depravity, regeneration, heaven and hell, victory over the world, and of unreserved consecration to Christ, but they hear little of them anywhere else. These, if they be truths, do not influence men's lives, and the enquirer denounces the whole system a worthless imposture. Beloved, does our practice give occasion to no such errors as these? If we enter not the kingdom of heaven ourselves, the mischief does not terminate here—those that are entering in we shall hinder, and on whom will the sin of their destruction rest?

Beloved, pardon, I beseech you, my plainness. But if these are the true sayings of the New Testament, ought they not to be spoken plainly? Was there ever a time, since the coming of Christ, in which the whole world stood in such perishing need of a universal revival of religion as the present? Was the world ever so universally open to Christian effort as it is now? The voice of God's providence seems emphatically to say to us, go ye up and possess the land. But can we go up until we cast ourselves loose from the entanglements of the world, and, in reality as well as in form, consecrate our whole selves and all that we possess, to the service of Christ? May God enable us to to reflect upon the solemnity of our position; may Zion arise and shake herself from the dust and put on her beautiful garments; and thus may the will of our Father who is in heaven be done on earth even as it is in heaven. C. D. H.

WILL GOD ANSWER PRAYER?

This is a strange question to appear in a religious periodical. It is still stranger that it should ever become a question among those who profess to worship God. There are but two classes of men who can possibly answer it in the negative, or even hesitate about answering it in the affirmative. They are those who do not believe in the inspiration of the Bible, and those who believe, but are ignorant of Bible teaching upon this subject. Neither of these classes *necessarily* answers in the negative, for many who have rejected the Bible have retained the belief that God will answer prayer. But he who accepts the Bible as the word of God, and is acquainted with its contents, has no alternative. From the days of Abraham's intercession for Sodom to the close of revelation, he finds examples and precepts and promises almost innumerable, affirming that God's eyes have always been over the righteous, and his ears open to their cries.

Yet there are many persons in the churches who have but little confidence in what the Bible teaches upon this subject. They are those who pray but seldom, or whose prayers are a mere form. How many thousands of worshippers are there in religious assemblies who go through the form of prayer with scarcely a thought of their prayers being answered. How many, indeed, of those who lead in public prayer, and of those who are punctual in private devotions, are moved entirely by a mere sense of duty, without the least stimulus from the hope that they will obtain what they ask for. They are like an old sister in the West, who stated her experience as follows: "The Bible says, if you will pray for a mountain to be removed into the sea, it will be done. Well, there is a hill between our house and the public road, I have been praying the Lord for a year, to move it out of the way, and he has not done it; and I *knew he wouldn't do it* when I was asking him."

No doubt much of the want of confidence upon this subject arises from a failure to understand it as it is presented in the Scriptures.—Now from the very nature of the case, there are many prayers which are not, and cannot be answered. One man is praying for rain, and another, whose interest is different, praying at the same time for dry weather. Two religious parties are each praying for triumph over the other, and two nations at war are each praying for victory. Thousands are praying, too, for God to do things which he has determined not to do, or to do them in a certain way when he has unchangeably fixed upon another way. That all such prayers can be answered is either physically or morally impossible, and this fact shows that there is a limitation to the rule that God will answer prayer. This limitation, properly defined, will lead us to a better understanding of the whole subject.

The apostle John says, "This is the confidence that we have toward Him, that if we ask anything according to his will, he hears us. And if we know that he hears us, whatever we ask, we know that we have the petitions which we have asked of him." Now the words "*according to his will*," constitute the limiting clause of this whole statement, so that only when we ask according to the will of God, can we claim that he hears and will answer us. This limitation is not often mentioned in the scriptures, probably because it is so obvious as not to need frequent repitition. But all the precepts we have, in reference to the place, the matter, and the manner of prayer, imply this limitation, by showing that God has a will upon the subject which must be complied with. The idea, therefore, is abundantly set forth in the scriptures.

This will of God, according to which we must pray, is not that

conceit of the fatalist, by which he has fixed in unalterable fate all things which come to pass in human history. If this were a reality all that we could gain by praying according to his will, would be obtained just as certainly, if we prayed not all; and there would be no such thing, properly speaking, as answer to prayer. But the will referred to is God's will *on the subject of prayer.* So the connection of thought requires us to understand it.

We can only know God's will, as he has revealed it to us. We know not, therefore, how to make our prayers accord with his will, except by making them accord with the scriptures. That a prayer which is contrary to the scriptures, and therefore contrary to the will of God, will remain unanswered, is a maxim of common sense. But a prayer may be contrary to the will of God in several particulars. It may be offered in a place which is forbidden; as the private prayers of the Pharisees while standing in the synagogues or on the corners of the streets. When they entered the synagogue, before taking their seats they lifted up their hands and offered a silent prayer, as the members of some churches now do, kneeling upon the benches; and as some preachers do, kneeling down when they first enter the pulpit. All such prayers are contrary to the will of God, and will not be heard in heaven. Again, a prayer may be offered through the wrong motive; to be seen by men, (Matt. 6. 5.), or to gratify some evil desire. (Jas. 4. 3.). It may be filled with vain repetitions, (Matt. 6. 7.), or it may be a prayer for something not promised. In none of these cases is the prayer *according to God's will*, and therefore an answer need not be expected.

The rule, that in order to obtain an answer from God, our prayers must be according to his will, is the great governing principle upon the subject. It prohibits prayer for anything, or in any manner, or under the influence of any motive, known to be contrary to his will. In reference to all matters which are doubtful, it requires the prayer to be hypothetical, and renders the answer equally doubtful. Hence in reference to life and all our plans for the future, James teaches us to say, "*If the Lord will*, we will live, and do this, or that;" and Paul calls upon the brethren at Rome to join with him in praying "that I may come to you with joy, *by the will of God*, and may be refreshed among you." Jesus himself also prays, "*If* it be possible, let this cup pass from me, yet not *my* will, but *thine* be done." This uncertainty as to what is the will of God, applies to thousands of things in the affairs of nations, of communities, and of individuals, and in reference to them all our prayers should be modestly limited by the condition, "If the will of the Lord be so." There is no positive

promise that such petitions will be granted, and therefore we should not, when offering them, too confidently anticipate an answer.

Again, when God promises certain blessings on certain conditions, our rule requires us to limit our prayers by the conditions imposed. We cannot pray for rain without a cloud, nor for food without labor. Neither can we pray for pardon in unbelief, in impenitence, or in disobedience. Here is the folly of mourning-bench prayers, which call upon God to pardon the sinner before he has complied with the conditions of pardon which the will of God prescribes. Whatever blessing from God, or attainment in Christian life, depends in part upon conditions to be complied with by us, or exertions made by us, can be asked for according to the will of God, only when the prayer is accompanied by the condition or the exertion. Hence Ananias commanded Saul to call on the name of the Lord as he was proceeding to be immersed, and wash away his sins; and hence we are to *forgive* when we pray "forgive us." When we pray for wisdom, which God has promised to give to all liberally, we are to let the word of wisdom dwell in us richly; when we pray for stronger faith, we must not forget that faith comes by the word of God; and when we pray for the salvation of sinners, we must preach to them the gospel which is the power of God to salvation.

But finally, when the will of God is certainly known, known in all its conditions, and our prayers are according to it, the answer is certain to be obtained. Of this we have the most solemn assurance of God's word, and if that cannot give us confidence, where will we go to find anything certain beneath the heavens? Let us, then, constantly study the will of God, and pray with an undoubting faith. We have this great truth to encourage us, that he who knows the most of God's will, will be certain, other things equal, to offer the most acceptable prayers. He who has most escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust, and partaken most of the divine nature, will most frequently will the same things that God wills, and therefore enjoy the most frequent answers to his prayers. There is a boundless room for improvement here, as in all other matters of Christian life. Even Paul could say, "We know not what to pray for as we ought," but "the Spirit helps our infirmities." Let us come, then, with humble hearts to the communication of the spirit, and learn what to pray for at all times, and to pray as we ought, that our praying may not be in vain. J. W. McGarvey.

There is that maketh himself rich, yet hath nothing; there is that maketh himself poor, yet hath great riches.

RATIONALIST SEPARATISM.

"Liberal Christianity" is the appellation now most preferred by the leading advocates of modern religious infidelity in the old and the new world. This is a specious name, ingeniously invented, and so far as all good Christians are concerned, these men and their followers may use it. Within the period of about one century, this infidelity, more or less defined, has been stealthily but steadily growing up in the bosom of Christendom. Tolerated and nurtured by radical errors, organic and doctrinal, and a wide spread, awful carnality and irreligion in the various church establishments, it has gone onward and onward, till to day it has become a great power in the Christian world. Its presence is now recognized—seen and felt everywhere among the churches. Our object in this article is, to call special attention to an important question now publicly mooted by these "liberal Christians"; the question, "What is the best policy of action? Shall each one of us 'abide' where he has been called; remain and labor earnestly to advance this 'liberal Christianity' in the church in which he has hitherto had a home; or shall we call all the faithful out, and form a distinct organization?" The voice of by far the larger majority of their magnates, their men of talents and of power, is, to "stay where you are, and use your present opportunities well in working for the common cause." To this purport is the following passage from the July number, 1864, of the *Westminster Review*, that great oracle of religious infidelity, in an article on "French (liberal) Protestantism":

"The leaders of liberal Christianity, that is, of the van of Protestantism, are now perfectly aware of the weakness which has hitherto followed from repeated schism; are on their guard against the narrow dogmatism which is liable to be generated in a sect, and foresee the danger of extinguishing Christian life in mere ecclesiastical controversy. They are determined, if possible, to avail themselves of the organization of existing Christian churches,—in which they have been bred, to which they owe their religious instruction, to which they owe that they have been able to become, as they believe, more far-seeing than their fathers,—they are religiously anxious to turn these organizations to a better account in the future than they have subserved in past times."

Men that reveal their Jesuitism in this open manner, are either blindly foolhardy, or are conscious of their power, and of a strong footing gained by them already in these ecclesiastical "organizations." But these words deserve to be seriously pondered by the yet faithful believers in the Bible, in all Christian lands. That this oracle sets forth the real plan of operations of this "van of Protestantism," we

have no reason for a moment to doubt. On all sides we see a confirmation of it. It is, as far as the wisdom of the serpent is concerned, —in a different sense, however, from the mind of Jesus,—also truly admirable. It has thus far worked most effectually, and this these new Jesuits know. In Germany, this abiding in the bosom "of the church in which they were bred," had at one time given to them almost the entire control of the Protestant church, which to-day, is only beginning again to be slowly wrested from them. Rationalism, more or less undisguised unbelief, for a while sat like a skeleton monarch, enthroned in chair, pulpit and school. The policy above indicated, is the one universally adopted there. Prof. Schenkel's late work, the "Character-bild Jesu,"—*Portraiture of the character of Jesus*,—that almost out-Herods Renan himself, is from the hands of an eminent dignitary of the Protestant church in Baden; and in spite of strong remonstrances, he maintains his place in the church, and as Professor of Theology in the University of Heidelberg. The same policy has been pursued in Switzerland, and with much success in France, in England, and in America. Dr. Schenkel insists on remaining in the church; so Reville, the eminent Walloon preacher and author; so did Coquerel, an able advocate of the new faith, and Renan, in Paris; so Bishop Colenso and others in England; and so not a few in America. Bravely these men fight for an abiding place at the domestic hearth. They know very well what "weakness" will come over them when they will be turned out into the cold, made to stand alone, stripped of the prestige and protection of a powerful church organization, with all its concomitant advantages, and set forth to the world as no longer one of the number of believers—as no longer preachers, bishops, theological professors, &c.,—but infidels. This all they deeply feel. Besides, there is another danger they clearly foresee in any effort at separate organization, which is also hinted at by the astute writer in the Westminster Review, in the above cited passage. "They are," he says, "on their guard against the narrow dogmatism which is generated in a sect, and foresee the danger of extinguishing Christian life in mere ecclesiastical controversy." Now the meaning of these words is simply this: they are well aware that they are in perfect union only in their negations, in denying the fundamentals in Christianity, in their war upon the common ancient faith of the Bible; but that in other respects they widely differ from each other. We know of no two of these "leaders" that in any positive matter agree with each other. Coquerel of Paris, though sympathizing generally and earnestly with his friend Renan in his attack upon the "orthodox" views, and for this reason dismissed from his position as preacher at the Oratoire, yet finds ma-

ny strong objections against Renan's Life of Jesus. Schenkel, again, while equally annihilating in his work the divinity of Jesus and his mission, nevertheless differs widely from and vigorously assails these others. So with Strauss, whom Renan attacks, and so with Colenso, who agrees with none of these others. So with this same negative school in America. Yet each one of these men is very dogmatical and persistent in his own views. Besides, not one of all this family now knows where he may yet finally land. So themselves say.—Now what kind of an organization and co-operation could be possible with such a body of heterogeneous, discordant, vigorous, active elements? A union even for limited purposes and even for a brief time, is utterly out of the question. It is difficult to tell on what single positive truth they could agree. Of this, then, they are perfectly aware; and therefore they would much prefer to be tolerated in the "old organizations," with which they have not the least sympathy, but where they can enjoy good, comfortable positions; where they can have a free course, as mere individuals, unembarrassed by any party obligations, subject to no terms of union with anybody; and so freely develop their sentiments and make war upon the common faith of Christians. A trial of union among these "liberals" would be like an attempt on the part of the objectors to our Bible to make a better one, on which they all could agree. This, indeed, Renan, Colenso and others are attempting; and with what success is evident to all.

Yet we cannot doubt that some of these men are self-deceived.—With the character of some we have been well acquainted for years, and know that they are incapable of designed hypocrisy. But while this must be said in their behalf, it does not make the case any better. Of others, however, we dare not say this. At best we know that there is a "pious deception" on their part, a casuistry that is not consistent with true candor and honesty. The less "politic," by their zeal sometimes expose the true character and extent of this hidden infidelity. The "leaders" have now and then occasion to reprove this imprudence in their more zealous and more undisguised brethren. One of these "leaders" in Switzerland writes to a religious journal at Heidelberg: "The party of religious progress sometimes fails in the necessary circumspection and prudence, and especially the extreme lack of caution on the part of Pastor Voegelin, in his public discourses, has alarmed many."

We confess that something remarkable meets us in the conduct of some of these leading spirits;—and that is, that men otherwise of the highest character for honor and candor, can bring themselves to play this sad part of appearing in position and language to be true believ-

ers and preachers of the faith of their church, and yet in heart, in conviction, in the secret, esoteric sense which they give to their language, are wide as the heavens separated from the faith of the church in which they stand forth as pretended believers and ministers. We cannot better express our views of such conduct than by translating a passage from a remarkable letter of the eminent Dr. Sack, preacher at the court of Berlin, to Schleiermacher, that prince of rationalists, who was regarded as the very soul of manly honor. "I cannot conceive," says Dr. Sack in this letter, "how a man that is attached to such a system (pantheistic rationalism), can be an honest teacher of Christianity; for no art of sophistry and of rhetoric can ever convince a sensible man that Spinozism and Christianity can exist together. I am convinced that as preacher, you will never advance those principles and ideas which in your book you advocate with so much contempt for the contrary views. You will, hereafter, rest satisfied in your preaching with the common notions of the dependence of man on God, our relation to the Supreme Being, and of the sentiments of adoration and thankfulness, and of the obedience and reliance that flow from it, in language that can be understood and that is perhaps biblical;—but you will do it as a man that does not believe a word of all this in his heart; that thus only condescends to the errors and superstition of the multitude; and in order not to give offense, will yet use expressions that with him have either no meaning at all, or one altogether different from the common one. What is a preacher that regards the universe as the Deity, to whom religion is nothing more than a contemplation of the universe; who knows no connection between religion and morality; that regards all motives to goodness proceeding from religion as false;—what a sad object of pity is such a man! How his heart must rebuke him at every word that he speaks in the pulpit, for his duplicity, hypocrisy, and perversion of truth, from motives of selfish gain, or a low fear of men, or a desire to please men! Solve me this problem, how you can yet be pleased with an employment, that must necessarily appear to you as the fruit and the advancement of stupidity and superstition;—how you can harmonize the continuing in this employment, as a matter of convenience, with your own feelings of right!"

We once knew a preacher of this class, who said that when first he entered into the pulpit, and administered the ordinances of the church, the awful hypocrisy of his conduct to his own heart, for a long time used to bring the sweat to his forehead. By degrees, however, he conquered this weakness.

In our own country where everything rushes to maturity more rapidly than in Europe; where men are less patient, oftentimes impru-

dently hasty; where, too, sect-life is so rampant and before every one's eyes; where every man likes to have and plow his own field and put his hand on his own and say, this is mine;—here, we say, we fear the policy of the "liberal" party of the old world will not hold out much longer, although it has worked admirably thus far. Here in America we are prone to boast of our 'progress,' and are eager at once to enjoy the fruits of our success. The "liberals" are beginning with pride to "number their people." At a late general convention of Unitarians,—a people now thoroughly "liberalized,"—one of their great lights, Dr. Bellows said, "Liberal ideas are spreading faster than Christian ideas, and hence our mission is to sanctify the former by the spirit of the latter There is evidently great anxiety among the leaders of the old sects, at some of the prevailing tendencies.—They fear the influence of liberal ideas, and this alarm proves that our principles are making headway." Dr. Bellows, therefore, at once, relying on the now acquired strengh, leaves the policy of the leaders of his party in Europe, and goes for an exodus of the liberals from the "old sects." His cry is, "Come out of her, my people." In this same speech he says, "Men are breaking away from old opinions. There is a great work to do. With faith in great ideas and Liberal Christianity, we should give ourselves zealously to the cause. Are we doing as much as we ought considering our wealth, position and influence? We do not accomplish as much in ecclesiastical as in other directions. Now, we cannot work either through or with any of the large denominations, &c". He therefore, urged the plan of an organization on a large scale, for missionary efforts. He demands that the "liberals" whoever and wherever they are, shall come forth, be separate, and unite in the great work he proposes.* Another voice of the same kind, and to the same purpose, is heard from Boston, this

* It will be said, that it is unfair to class Dr. Bellows and his brethren with the extreme class of European and American "liberal Christians." We are well aware that he and some others of his fraternity have not arrived at the goal reached by the latter. That, however, this system of Unitarianism, distinctly *now* so-called, leads straight thither—that its churches are filled with extreme rationalists—that from its bosom, as a fecund hotbed, large numbers constantly grow up into this bald infidelity,—we think is beyond doubt. We know, moreover, that American Unitarians are the favorite religious party of this country with European "liberals" of all, even the extreme school, and are by them regarded as their hope here. This, we say, we know. The fact is, this Unitarianism of to-day is the ever-ready Charon, whose business it is, in his leaky boat, to ferry these departed *shades* of faith, who belong no longer to the old world of faith, across the Styx into the land of "liberal Christianity" of unbounded license of thought and views,—that Elysium of all the errant, vagrant souls of our day!—C. L. L.

central, radiant sun of "liberal ideas." A Mr. Sawyer, who years ago tried to teach his rationalism in the Presbyterian church as a minister, and no doubt as all these do, did this as long as he was tolerated,—sends forth a call in the *Liberator* to the rationalists of America to form a separete body. He says:

"Finally, let us have a Rationalist association and convention, and come together from our different denominations of Christians during the next anniversary week in Boston, shake hands together, compare views, consider questions of policy, truth, and duty, and address ourselves to saving the world, the true end and object of the mission of Jesus, and of all true Christianity." Such a shaking of hands, and such a salvation of the world!

To this separatism it must come with these men, one way or another. In spite of their more politic leaders in Europe, it is coming to that also there. This is inevitable. In Germany the true believers are gathering strength every day, and the battle between faith and unbelief is waxing hotter and hotter, and the lines must be drawn ecclesiastically by and by. Dr. Schenkel's work, above alluded to, has been met with a powerful remonstrance among the clergy and laity of Baden. In Geneva where the national church became rationalized the true men, such as D'Aubigne, Malan, Gaussen and others, withdrew from it, and these men and their colaborers, are drawing the lines closer every day between a true faith in the Bible and the prevailing religious infidelity. There lately the gifted Reville was refused the pulpit even of the national church. We learn that in Zurich and elsewhere in Switzerland the true believers whom the "liberals" are stigmatizing as the "pious," are meditating a separation from the polluted national church. In France the Monods and others did the same as D'Aubigne and his compeers in Geneva. Colenso will be pushed out of the English church in spite of the temporary decisions of courts and other powerful influences, and the tendency is strong there to put these men all on their true ground. Here before the great impending battle of faith and unbelief is ended, the lines of separation will be strictly drawn. Let every man be made to stand where he really belongs. No truce with any form of infidelity, or other mischievous error, however fair-faced and fair-spoken. We trust the voice of invitation from Boston will be heard and heeded by all that have abandoned the true ancient faith in Christ, the old faith of the Bible, the faith of the apostles and martyrs. Let these go where they belong, rather than stand on the false ground they now occupy in their old associations.

The Christian world will ever and anon have to learn many important Bible lessons over again. To watch jealously against any toler-

ance of false and pernicious doctrines,—especially radically false views of Christ and of the Bible, in its bosom,—is a lesson often to be learned over again. Why will the church, after all the commands and solemn warnings of the Holy Spirit, in their false, over-tolerant charity, forbear with and overlook such fatal errors? God does not overlook these sins against his truth and his authority; against the awful majesty of his Son; against the claims of the crucified Christ, whose name and power alone can triumph over hell;—a true faith in whom alone will save! This treachery to God in being false to the holy trust committed to our charge, will not, cannot, pass unnoticed and unpunished by the Most High, who will vindicate His name and the name and dignity of his Son! Away with this treacherous forbearance, this licentious, human, charity!

We have a profound interest in this question;—the faith in Jesus as the Son of God, as divine, in opposition to the slippery confusions and negations of Unitarianism and rationalism; the faith in the Bible as the infallible inspired word of God;—this is the great foundation we have to build on in our work to call the world back to Primitive Christianity. To save this faith is the common interest of all that truly love God and his cause. C. L. L.

CHRONICLES OF THE HEART.

There is a verification of God's word in the experience of the truly devout, that is both pleasant and profitable; and while we think that some have made too much of what is called a Christian experience before a person has in fact become a Christian, others have made too little of the experiences of God's ways and word in the daily life of those who love and honor the Lord. It is certain that much of the Scriptures is made up of the recorded experiences of the righteous, and they are written for our learning. Would it not be well for us to look into these things and profit by them? Christianity has much to do with the mind and heart. It is spirit and truth dealing with our spirits. It is a life within, as real as the life of sense; and we have and may have as much consciousness of the one as of the other. We are not unmindful of heat and cold, of hunger and thirst, of poverty and distress, of health and sickness, of friends and foes, and of the daily vicissitudes of our mortal life. Why should we be indifferent to the conditions and experiences of our spiritual life, and equally affected by all the changes and variations which attend it. "I serve the Lord," said David; why? "because he hath heard my voice and my supplications." (Ps. 116. 1.) Here is one of the rich experiences of King David. God had heard his voice, listened to his supplica-

tions, and the knowledge of this quickened his love. Surely a similar experience every Christian has, and the effects should be the same. This is bringing our religion home to the heart, where it should be, and making us mindful of God's dealings with us. "This is my comfort in affliction, for thy word hath quickened me." (Ps. 119: 50.) David did not speak this *ex cathedra*. It was the experience of his life. He had comfort in affliction, and the reason of it was, that God's word quickened him. He felt the new life bubbling up within him. The vitalizing properties of the word penetrated all the powers of his mind and will. He arose from the bed of affliction a wiser and better man. Are we sufficiently alive to these blessed influences? Is this the life of faith that we are pursuing? Without reflection and close examination, he could not have realized this "comfort." It was in fact a conscious part of his religious life. David "knew that God favored him," and why? "by his deliverances." (Ps. 41: 11.) See how logical were his conclusions. Many were his enemies, his trials and embarrassments. God delivered him out of them, and he therefore concludes that God favored him. May we not reason in the same way? Surely such experiences are sweet and comforting.

What a glorious roll of Christian experience does the apostle open before us in that memorable passage, "That tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope." (Rom. 5: 4.) Is this the mere rhetoric of Christianity? Is it a philosophic statement addressed to the reason? Is it not the inward life of the child of God? This whole cluster of fruit grows upon the tree of life. It is the experience we have of God's gracious dealings with us under the reign of favor. It was written by Paul, because he had realized it; and sent to the saints at Rome, because it was their blessed experience; and it is given to us that we may observe the divine effects of a life of faith, and feel all the bliss and enjoyment that follow in its wake of sanctified affliction. "I know," said Paul, "whom I have trusted, and I am persuaded he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." (2 Tim. 1: 22.) This knowledge of God whom he had long trusted, afforded him the assurance that he was able to keep that which Paul had committed to his hands against the coming day. This example is worthy of our imitation. This daily record of mercies received, should be carefully remembered, as the foundation of future trust and hope. The more we see and feel and know of the faithfulness of God in his word of promise, the more shall we be strengthened in view of what remains. Former comforts are pledges that God will not forsake us in the future. J. C.

A WALTER SCOTT MONUMENT.

BRO. W. B. MOOKLAR'S PROPOSITION.

We are gratified to see the feeling and thought of the brotherhood on this subject taking practical shape. Our zealous and beloved Bro. Mooklar takes the lead, and advances with a generous proposition, which ought to be responded to by double the number of persons that he names. Our readers have doubtless seen this proposition as it appeared in the Christian Review of Feb. 7th.

Bro. Mooklar justly claims to speak for Bro. Scott, from the fact "that few persons enjoyed more of his entire confidence and friendship than himself, from the commencement of the present reformation to the day of his death." We were gratified to find that we were right in the view we presented some months since, as to what would be a monument that would please Walter Scott himself; and that Brother Mooklar is determined to labor and give for its erection. We will do our readers a service by laying his proposition before them, together with the earnest words of exhortation by which he calls upon the able and benevolent ones among us to come up to his help. He says:

"I propose to be one of twenty brethren, who will give one thousand dollars each, by, or before the 1st day of May next, making a cash capital of twenty thousand dollars, which amount, the donors, as *stewards* of Almighty God, offer to him, on his sacred altar, as a *New Year's gift*, a *token* of the sincerity of their affection, and appreciation of his continued kindness during the past year; thus honoring God *first*. The *funds* thus raised, I propose to call the *Walter Scott funds*, and thus honoring *him second*. The funds as collected, shall be received and receipted for by some responsible brother, who will act as *Treasurer* for the time being, and whose duty it shall be to invest the same in interest bearing bonds, or, other safe securities; his stewardship of said funds to continue till the next October convention of brethren at Cincinnati, at which time five trustees shall be appointed to take the custody of said funds, with all interest that may have accrued on the same, to that date. Presuming that the funds above named could be made to net eight per cent, per annum, we should have a *yearly* fund of sixteen hundred dollars, which amount, or any other amount, that may arise from the Walter Scott funds, shall be equally divided, and appropriated as follows, *for ever*, viz: one-half for the educating of indigent young brethren for the proclamation of the unadulterated word of God; and the remaining one-half for the support of 'worn out,' indigent proclaimers of the gospel of Christ. Now for bro. Scott's answer. To all the foregoing propositions, save

the *name* given to designate the funds, bro. Scott would say, amen, and amen, 'bless the Lord O my soul, and all that is within me, bless his holy name,' that my dear brethren have still an eye to the 'perfection of Christian character.' As a proof that the above would be substantially his response, I will give you an extract from one of his letters to the writer, dated at Pittsburg, March 19th 1849. He says: 'I am busy with eight or ten young persons who are desirous of becoming preachers of the gospel. The class is progressing in a very flattering manner indeed. Some of them even now, can deliver a sermon of some merit. For the balance of my days I shall, I believe labor, with the help of the great Master, to give gifts to the churches —pastors and teachers. O! that I could raise up to the cause, 1,000 efficient evangelists, pastors and teachers! Do pray that Christ would appoint me to this honor &c.' Can any one, after reading the above extract from the heart and pen of bro. Scott, doubt the answer he would now give, were he with us? Having then arrived at the unquestioned knowledge of what would be the pleasure of our dear departed brother, as to the appropriation of any funds that might have been donated for the erection of a monument, or anything else, other than the cause of Christ, shall we not, then, brethren and sisters, at this most appropriate season, and in view of the responsibility we are under to God, the giver of all we have and are—shall we not, I say, unite in an offering, that will be well pleasing to our heavenly Father, and a standing monument of our high respect and love for bro. Scott, *for all time to come?*—Some may say, twenty thousand dollars is a large sum; not so, it is a *small* one, when looked at from a true Christian stand-point. What is that, or any amount of money, when compared with the value of an immortal soul?—What is it to the heart-felt pleasure, the benevolent Christian man is the recipient of, in the thanks, the tears of gratitude, the devout prayers in his behalf, of that gray headed servant of the Most High, to whose wants, when unable to help himself, he has ministered?

"How is it possible for a disciple of Christ to fondly dream of heaven, a *home* in heaven, and yet refuse, when God has committed to his care an abundance of this world's goods, to freely give of that abundance for the support of that cause which cost the blood of Christ, and in which he *professedly* appears to place all his hopes for a future salvation; or clutching his soul-poisoning bag of gold, turns a deaf ear to the supplications of the infirm and poor, but worthy servant of the Lord? I tell you reader, such a professor of the Christian religion stands no more chance of entering the pearly gates of heaven, than the devils from the region of eternal despair. Do you say this is too harsh an expression? I answer, and apologize at the same time, by

saying, *it's true.* Not one word will I take back, until you show me one word within the lids of the Bible that contradicts it. When you do this, then I am on my knees to you in a moment. No sir, if you are one of this class you deserve a thousand times more than anything I have, or *can* say on the subject. May God in his mercy deliver the disciples from the devil's most succcessful snare, the *love* of money, that rock on which so many have been and are being wrecked, while heaven's chart has most clearly pointed out its precise latitude and longitude to every voyager on life's boisterous ocean. Mind the Pilot, look aloft, or you are lost, and lost forever. It is well known that we have in the church many, very many brethren and sisters of large means and liberal hearts; and to all such I now appeal in the name of our blessed Savior, to freely co-operate with me in this truly Christian enterprise.—Remember, reader, this is a far better investment than in our favorite 'five-twenties, ten-forties,' although they are payable, principal and interest, in *gold;* yet it is a gold that *perishes.* Far more profitable is this investment, far more productive than any oil well that ever has, or ever will be struck, for it affords in this life an abundance of the 'oil of gladness,' and in the world to come *eternal life.* Brethren in the Lord, I must not, I cannot be denied in this undertaking. The amount proposed is but a *nucleus,* around which will soon cluster thousands, and tens of thousands, if now you come up to the help of the church. Now is the time to set the ball a rolling, which is destined to roll on forever. For the wants of the church, remember, will never cease till *Jesus shall come again.* Can you refuse your aid, brother or sister, as the case may be, and feel that you are prepared to meet your Lord and Savior? Impossible, if you are one that God has bestowed the means upon.

"Ah, brethren, we have not long to remain on this earth; soon we shall all go the 'spirit land,' where we can no more have the opportunity of placing before the Lord a New Year's gift, nor of aiding in the cause of Christ, or of giving bread to the hungry. The summer will have gone, the harvest *past;* do not, then, I beseech you, hesitate for a moment, but prove your *faith* by your *works.* This, this only can be acceptable to the Lord. 'Lay up for *yourselves* treasures in *heaven,*' is the language of inspiration. Will you do it? I believe you will; and who can tell, who calculate the immense amount of good to grow out of this arrangement, long after you and I have gone to the other world, and when our children's children will rise up and call us blessed. Everything must have a *beginning,* and as to the *time* of beginning so great and glorious a work as now proposed, when could a more appropriate one be found than the present one.—While the *Old* year lingers for a moment before it takes its final de-

parture, to learn whether the disciple of Christ whom it has so richly blessed with all spiritual and temporal blessings, during its full twelve months administration, were grateful, or, ungrateful; whether it should enter upon its closing page, to be copied on heaven's everlasting record, that those who profess to be the *children of God*, would refuse to give for the spread of the Christian religion, and the support of tho poor, *only one-half the sum* that the *pews* in "Henry Ward Beecher's Church" sold for since the commencement of this year. Yes, reader, it *is true*, the pews in the said church sold *last year* for thirty-one thousand, and a few days since for *forty thousand dollars*. I bow my head in confusion, my cheek burns with shame, when I look at the immense sums given annually for the support of *sectarianism*, and the contemptible sums we as a people, a church, are contributing for the Lord's heaven ordained cause.

"Brethren, are you aware that there are those among us, whose incomes, per annum, are five, ten, twenty, forty and sixty thousand dollars? If you are not, I tell you it is so; and many such would vouch for what I assert, if necessary. We have the *means* then, brethren, and there is no excuse that can be made by us, that would be accepted in heaven should we refuse to build up and *sustain* the cause of Christ on earth. But I will not allow myself to think such will be the fate of this effort, but with open hands, and liberal hearts, the brethren will unite in presenting to our heavenly Father a new Year's gift, by which we shall do that which will be pleasing to him, and at the same time perpetuate our sincere love for our departed bro. Walter Scott. O that the brethren would increase the amount named one hundred per cent, and this they could do, and more with propriety if they would. Why, I heard last week of a good and wealthy brother of our State (Kentucky) who proposed a donation of ten thousand dollars for educational purposes, every dollar of which would go out of Kentucky, for the benefit of a sister State. Noble gift indeed. O that that liberal brother's eye may fall on these lines, and see, and feel the *magnitude* and *importance* of our creating a fund for the church, to be, as is contemplated, for *all time to come*, as the humble writer views it. In looking at it in all its bearings, its length and breadth, for *time* and *eternity*, I frankly acknowledge my incapacity to express myself as the subject justly demands, and hope that abler pens will finish the rough notes, or work. I have undertaken with a strong faith, but with many misgivings as to my ability, to place the subject as it deserves before the brethren in Christ; but should I be doomed to disappointment in raising the funds named, what then?—Will you give up the ship? Never! I have put my hand to the plow, and am not of that stripe that looks back, but will plead sub-

stantially for what I have above attempted to set forth, as long as life is in me. My one thousand is ready, *at sight*, and if there is never another dollar added to the funds, my humble mite, the lone star, will, of itself, form a nucleus, that God will surely bless, causing many a heart to rejoice, and many a cheek to burn with *shame*. Give up the ship, *indeed!* when I have the *sure* word of my heavenly Father, that *He* will help me. That's the secret of my boasting and my *strength*. I only regret that I have not fifty thousand to give; but I bless the Lord for what he enables me to do, and ask no quarters for myself, but everything for the cause of Christ.

"Bro. Franklin, you know I have not been in the habit of placing my thoughts on paper for *publication*, but seeing in the columns of your paper the everlasting cry of want, want, and proposition after proposition for this, that, and the other good work, without anything more being done in the case, I found myself compelled to come out and take a position in *front*, which from the fulness of my heart, and in the sincerity of my soul, I have done, in the one hope of exciting my brethren to prove their sincerity in their *profession* of *love to God*.—Words, and *only* words, from any one who *has the ability* to DO good, is but an *insult* to high heaven,

Truly yours in Christ, WM. B. MOOKLAR."

This is a communication that cannot fail to move many hearts.—We gladly add the following, which it has called forth from the pen of our devoted Bro. Milligan, President of Ky. University:

"*Bro. Franklin*:—I have just received the Review of the 7th inst., in which I see a proposition from our beloved brother Wm. B. Mooklar, touching the Walter Scott Monument, which I think should receive the serious consideration of our whole brotherhood. It is certainly a movement in the right direction, and just what I would expect from Bro. Mooklar.

"The brotherhood in our State should have the three following funds, sacredly devoted to the three following purposes: The first should be a fund for educating pious, gifted, and indigent young men for the work of the Christian ministry. The second, a fund for sustaining missionaries while actually engaged in the missionary work. And the third, a fund for the relief and support of '*worn out*' or superannuated ministers of the word.

"Several of the States have made some progress in raising the first and second of these funds. But to Bro. Mooklar belongs the honor, so far as I know, of proposing the third, and of supporting his proposition by a liberal donation. And to him, therefore, it properly belongs to give and specify the details of whatever scheme of Christian philanthropy he may himself think most appropriate.

"But as Bro. Mooklar has not yet fully defined his scheme, and as I know that his sole object is to accomplish as much as possible by the proposed donations, I would respectfully offer for his more mature consideration, the following suggestions:

"1. That the funds which he proposes to raise for the two-fold purpose of qualifying young men for the ministry of Christianity, and also for supporting 'worn out' preachers, would, in my judgment, be most judiciously and efficiently managed by *State* Boards. Our National or American C. M. Society, comprehends too wide a scope of territory for such purposes. We had better assign this work to the several State societies.

"2. But if it is thought best that but one *general* fund should be raised for the honor of our departed brother, then would it not be best, as Bro. Wm. K. Pendleton suggested in a late Harbinger, to vest such fund in some one of our Literary Institutions? and to create in it either a Walter Scott Chair of Sacred Literature, or a Walter Scott Library of Sacred Literature for the benefit of young brethren who design to prepare themselves for the work of the Christian ministry?

"The want of such a library is just now severely felt in Kentucky University. We have on record the names of 118 matriculates. Of these, about 70 are members of the Christian church; and of these again, about 30 are studying with special reference to the ministry of Christianity, the oldest and most advanced of whom have entered into an association called the Philothean Society, for the purpose of improving themselves in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures; in the writing and reading of moral and religious essays; and also in the composition and delivery of sermons. In all these exercises they very much need the assisrance of many standard works on Biblical Literature. But Bro. Mooklar and many of our other good Kentucky brethren will be surprised to hear, that for such assistance they have to depend wholly on books *borrowed* from their friends. One year ago, this day, our University was destroyed by fire; and with it was consumed everything pertaining to the Philothean Library. Will our friends allow one other year to pass without supplying the wants of these noble young brethren? I leave it to such men as Bro. Wm. B. Mooklar to answer this question. O that we had ten thousand such brethren in the Mississippi Valley. Then indeed our colleges would soon be liberally endowed; many pious, gifted and indigent young brethren, who are now struggling in adversity, would soon be sought out and qualified for the ministry of the Word of Life; our evangelists would soon be liberally sustained in all their works of faith and labors of love; and in a word, the knowledge of the Lord would soon cover the whole earth as the waters cover the sea.

"But I have said enough on this subject. I wish merely to make the foregoing suggestions to Bro. Mooklar. I know that he will do what he believes to be right. And whether he and other liberal friends and admirers of the lamented Scott, conclude to raise a fund for superannuated preachers; or to educate a certain number of young men for the work of the Christian ministry; or to endow a Walter Scott Chair in Bethany College, or a Walter Scott Library of Sacred Literature in Kentucky University, I will rejoice at the result. May God help us all to remember that we have been bought with a price; and that to glorify him therefore, with all that we have and are, is but our reasonable service. R. MILLIGAN.

KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY, Feb. 16, 1865."

We commend, in hope, these earnest and wise words of brethren Mooklar and Milligan. We apprehend there will be but little difficulty in properly disposing of the proposed benevolence, if it can only be obtained. The parties who give it can say to whose trusteeship they will commit it. For our part, we very cordially subscribe to Bro. Milligan's suggestions. But we are anxious in the first place to secure the donations. Bro. Mooklar is a Christian gentleman of large experience, great energy, and an enthusiasm in every good work that is positively contagious; and he is just the man to make the scheme succeed. Let him not give back, then, and in raising a monument to Walter Scott, he will, like the divinely-inspired builders of the temple, transmit his own name also to the gratitude of the coming generations of the church. W. K. P.

UNSOUND ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF TRUTH.

In debating with sectarian preachers, our brethren have often been too generous in framing the proposition for discussion. No immersionist is logically bound to affirm that "Immersion is the only Scriptural action in baptism"; for this is affirming a negative, equivalent to—sprinkling and pouring *are not* baptism. In all fairness, the opposition should affirm sprinkling to be baptism, and we simply examine his arguments. Still, with all this odds against us, we have never lost a battle on this ground.

There is another negative, however, which we have all been affirming publicly and privately, to which I would invite attention, because I think the attempts to prove what we are under no obligation to affirm, have developed arguments on our side that could be refuted.—Such arguments can be of no possible advantage to the cause of truth, but the reverse; for once refuted, the truth they were intended to support will suffer by the defeat.

We have been fond of affirming that *The Spirit operates only through the word*: that is, that it *does not operate in any other way*—a bold negative that we are not called upon to prove. Negative as it is, it may be true and the proposition itself altogether irrefutable, but if the proposition does contain a truth ever so important, still the arguments used in its support may after all be unsound, for it is a universal negative, for the demonstration of which our arguments may be wholly inadequate. We may sometimes prove a negative that covers but little ground, as in case of a man charged in court with the commission of a certain crime, at a certain specified time and place, who may prove an *alibi*—that he was somewhere else at the time; but suppose I affirm that no man on earth is, at this moment, thinking of the same thing precisely that I am thinking of, how could I prove it? It may be true, but how can it be proved? I think I could prove that some men are entertaining no such thoughts. It may be safely concluded that the generals on the James are busy with other matters, that the surgeon amputating a limb, the lawyer pleading his client's cause, the robber rummaging a lady's trunk, the school boy at marbles, the keeper of a bar-room, and a leader of the dance, are all engaged with other thoughts; but to prove the universal negative that no man at this instant is thinking of these things but myself, it would be necessary to know the thoughts of every man at this very moment. Richter argues with the atheist that he can never prove his negative that there is no God, for it would require him to be at every point of space at the same instant;—he must fill with his presence all that intervenes between the zenith and the nadir, the illimitable east and west; he must occupy every degree and every second of the grand periphery that belts in the universe, and beyond the frontiers of creation wherever space can be found, and see for himself that there is no God; so that it would take a God to prove that there is no God.

The proposition that the "Spirit of God operates in no way except through the word," as a universal negative, involves similar difficulties. It may be true, but who can prove it? Had it been affirmed that *the Bible reveals no other way*, the subject would have come within the reach of our capacity. But to assume that there are no "secret things that belong to the Lord" and that the little the bible reveals to us admits us into the privy councils of the Almighty, is to assume that we are more worthy and better able to know all the machinery of the spiritual universe than our children are to understand the plans of earthly parents.

As all parties admit that the Spirit does operate through the truth, and as some do not admit that the bible teaches any other way, the

proposition should always be stated so as to throw our opponents on the affirmative. Let them affirm that the Spirit operates directly and without a medium, and let us keep in the rear and see whether they can adduce a single passage touching the spirit's influence in conversion which may not be fairly interpreted as exerted through the word. *I do not believe a passage of this kind can be found.* They will be as impotent as we are when we undertake to prove our negative.

But the caption of this article promised an instance or two at least of unsound arguments in support of truth, or of what may be true.—The passage found in Rom. 1. 16. so often quoted to prove our negative fails, I think, to do all we ask of it. "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation." Does this prove that the spirit operates *only* through the gospel? Certainly is it implied that he does operate through this truth, but who is authorized to insert the word *only*? Is the gospel the *only* power of God unto salvation? It may be, but this passage fails to prove it. We are justified by faith, but are we justified by faith *only*? There is just as much proof for the one as for the other as far as these passages prove anything. In one place no influence but the gospel is mentioned, and in the other no influence but faith, and the word *only* has as much right in one case as in the other. The argument is therefore unsound and should not be relied on, as it is too easily refuted.

Again, "The word of God is the sword of the Spirit." This passage shows that the Spirit of God uses the word as a man uses a sword, that it is the defensive and offensive weapon, but does not prove all we ask of it. Here again we repeat, the spirit may use no other instrument, but, logically, this passage does not prove it. What we know is that the "preaching of the gospel is the power of God to us who are saved" and if any one knows of any other power, let him show what it is, and let us be content to know what the Spirit does accomplish by the means he has revealed, and not assume o know what he *does not* do. In the hazy distance where the seen and the unseen edge up together, our vision ceases, and there we are compelled to answer many a question with "I do not know." This is true of things natural as well as spiritual. Paul has brought this matter into view in saying that "Paul may plant and Apollos water but God causes to grow." This must be true in the vegetable kingdom as well as in the spiritual, or it would not have served as an illustration. And now, plainly; has God lodged *all* vegetable power in the earth, the sun, rain and seed, or does he add a direct influence besides by his upholding power to produce the result? Has he reserved any portion of the power necessary for germination by which he may reinforce nature's ability, or do the laws of nature possess

plenary powers of growth without any such reinforcement? If any one can settle this question in the vegetable world, the question of direct operations of the Spirit will also be settled, for the one illustrates the other. But as no modest man will pretend to settle the former, the latter is certainly to be counted among the "secret things that belong to God." And as we are unable to penetrate this mystery in nature and to prove that God does not operate in any way except through natural laws to produce a plant, but must admit that he *may* employ other forces, how can we prove that he does not operate with any spiritual forces beyond what he has revealed to us; And who can prove the converse of this negative? The field seems to be one we are not called upon to explore, nor to discuss at all, unless our opponents will undertake to establish their peculiar dogma affirmatively.

It is of much more consequence to us to inquire whether we are personally partakers of the Holy Spirit and of the divine nature; whether the "love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which is given to us," and whether we enjoy "the peace that passeth understanding, and that, in these evil days, keeps our minds and hearts through Christ Jesus" preparing us for that place which is

"Far from a world of grief and sin
With God eternally shut in."

THOMAS MUNNELL.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC.

BRO. J. W. MCGARVEY:—Your response to my brief notes on your argument from Silence against instrumental music in churches, is before me in the Millennial Harbinger for February. I feel well persuaded your kindness will permit me to look over this effusion from your pen with the same frankness you manifest, and which I sought to show in my article. I am aware that justifiable investigation is liable to degenerate into controversy; the evils of which I regard as so numerous, and so damaging to the spirit of piety and brotherly love, that my soul rather shrinks from than seeks the contest. I am happy, however, to know that we have a competent umpire over us, in the persons of the discriminating editors of the Harbinger, who will doubtless "keep the peace."

A candid and careful survey of your reply, convinces me that my feeble effort has had some effect. It seems to me to have shaken the foundation of your argument; or, perhaps, I should say, its effect is to develop more clearly what its foundation really is.

Your argument from Silence assumes that instrumental music is a constituent part, or divinely appointed element, of the Jewish economy. This is not only assumed in your first article, but it is repeated in your reply. See Harbinger for Feb., p. 89. In your first article you introduce the incense and the priestly robe to illustrate and enforce the disuse and condemnation of instrumental music:—to show that it, like them, and for the same reason, has passed away. The structure and conduct of the argument treats them as parallel in source of authority, and in intentional reprobation from the Christian economy. Then surely it was no evasion on my part, employed for a purpose (a dishonesty of which I hope not to be justly chargeable), to suppose, as I did, not that the clear-minded Bro. McGarvey, but that his *argument*, laid the authority for instrumental music in the *Law of Moses*.

We now find that the argument neither nests nor rests in the enactments of the Jewish lawgiver. That basis for its support is now given up—magnanimously surrendered. For I still think, perhaps erroneously, that the article of November laid your major premise on the *Law*.

We are now referred for proof that God *ordained* instrumental music under the Jewish economy (for this assumption the argument affirms and needs), not to Moses, but to David; not to the lawgiver, but to the poet; not to Sinai, but to Zion! Lo! an immense chasm of almost five hundred years yawns between its former supposed intrenchment and its present declared base! Verily, permitting me to imitate a couple of examples of rhetoric in your present article, two or three more such removes, and the basis of divine authority for the custom will be found fairly and fully within the Christian dispensation; a result I might, with you, sincerely deprecate.

Now for the argument once more, with this new aspect of the case before us:

"God ordained instrumental music in the former economy;
He left it out of the Christian dispensation;
Therefore, We should leave it out of the church."

Do not, Bro. McGarvey, regard me too inquisitive in asking the proof that God ever required of the Jews the use of instrumental music?

I am quite well aware of what "David and the captain of the host" did, "separating to the service of the sons of Asaph, of Heman and of Jeduthan, to prophesy with harps and with psalteries and with cymbals." The royal poet and musician wrought many changes, doubtless in no wise contravening the divine authority, and instituted many regulations giving exaltation and adding to the grandeur of the

temple worship. But a question of the character of this which we have under consideration, requires express authority to rest upon; for it assumes to tell us that God expressly and intentionally condemns the practice. We must, therefore have direct testimony that God instituted it under the old dispensation.

Following the example set me, of indicating to me how to reply to your position, I may venture modestly to suggest that no flourish of rhetoric will pass for testimony. Neither, as it seems to me will it meet the case to prove that several other things were introduced by divine warrant, either under the royalty, before it, or after it. It surely is not demanding too much to ask the word which shows that this practice in question was appointed of God. I am well pleased with many things you have said, and with this thought among others, that we as a people are well disciplined in the value of direct and positive authority for all our affirmations in religion. *My doubt now awaits the testimony.*

I heartily concur with you that we need more critical and thorough acquaintance with the character, design, genius, and relation to each other of the great dispensations of our holy religion. I agree with you that many in our own ranks, and perhaps many who plead the gospel, are alarmingly ignorant of these rudimental themes. With respect to this subject, we might apply the language of the prophet, "Darkness covers the earth, and gross darkness the people."

Your remark about "will-worship," I pass by. I think there is a different interpretation, or rather use of the term—one which seems to me more correct. But I join no issue on it. That is not the subject of the present investigation. There are three words, however, in the paragraph marked "2," which I do not like. I was not aware that I was engaged in *defending* the use of instrumental music in churches. I supposed the logic of Lexington too acute thus to misunderstand me! I might have omitted any reference to this; but I was afraid to depend on *silence* to do me justice herein, especially as I see an effort, which I much regret, to crowd me over where no man has a right, from anything I ever said or did, to represent me as standing.

I am happy, Bro. McGarvey, in the persuasion that this interchange of views between us shall be strictly within the limits of brotherly love. It is true there is much written and spoken in such investigations that betrays a want of Christian courtesy. In scientific investigations men treat each other with gentlemanly urbanity. Should not a marked respect, at least of equal dignity and gracefulness, displace from among us all bluntness, coarseness and unfair dealing?

It is probable there will be no occasion for me any further on this *floor*. Can I not depend on you now to manage the argument alone

the rest of the way? I intended no protracted investigation. I have no traps to set. And I have little doubt our candid and discerning brotherhood will be able to come to judicious and correct conclusions in the premises. On prudential grounds, I more than question the propriety of introducing or permitting the general practice of instrumental music in the churches. But really, candidly, seriously, is there not a great danger, perhaps a serious damage, liable, and even likely to result, from the conclusion which your argument seeks to enforce?

☞ Granting the work done, the argument sound, the conclusion vindicated; what then? That the use of instrumental music is unauthorized? Nay, far more. It is condemned by the Holy Spirit.—If condemned by the Holy Spirit, condemned also by God our Father; by Christ our Savior; condemned by prophets and apostles, by the angels, and by all the universe of good beings; for all are in harmony under the captaincy of King Jesus. And then what? We are bound by an authority we dare not resist, to condemn, reject, eject, every church, every member who persists in the flagrant sin. Then come alienation, bitterness, strife, ill will, dissension, schism. This is the inevitable result. I see no avoidance of this train of dire calamities which your argument, sustained, hurries along, and hurls over our churches like blazing coals of fiery strife. ☜

Not, therefore, as a mere logical diversion have I come from behind my loved retiracy, to examine the soundness of the premises on which a conclusion was based fraught with such vast and fearful consequences to the peace and prosperity of the church of Christ. To my mind it is self-evident that no divine legislation was ever made touching this subject; and that any attempt to rank it among questions of law, as regulated by divine enactment, is far outside the range of truth and sound judgment in the case. It must be left among the subordinate regulations to be managed by the good sense of the brethren, under the presiding presence of the good spirit of kindness and brotherly love, which teaches us to give "no offense either to the Jew, or to the Gentile, or to the church of God." A plentiful supply of the Spirit which impels and compels us "to suffer long and be kind," "to bear one with another," "to esteem others better than ourselves," will in all cases prevent difficulties from arising on questions of this nature. To insist on its introduction in opposition to the feelings of the members of the church, would be, as all can see, a violation of the great law of love. Whether it would be wise to use the instrument in any case may be safely left to the brethren locally interested in the question. The assumption of the right to decide for them, to dictate to them in questions clearly relating to their

own peace, harmony and edification, and to visit upon them the penalties of the greater or lesser excommunication is to re-enact the persecutions of the odious Star Chamber of the reign of Charles the First, or to employ the *ex cathedra* tyranny of the papacy.

It must be regarded as a grievous offense, as a high misdemeanor in the kingdom of the Lord Jesus for a citizen thereof who has entered into the most solemn vow to be gentle toward all men, to be peaceable, and easy to be entreated, to become such a dogmatist, and so opinionated as not to walk with his brethren in the bonds of Christian fellowship and brotherly love unless they agree with him in all questions of prudence and social regulation;—and to draw off, and thus sever the sacred bonds of the unity of the Spirit. Is not this to tolerate the sin of disunion; nay, to commit it, while heralding to all men that we are the very people who are restoring the unity of the church on the "*faith*" once delivered to the saints?

In Christian love, your brother, A. S. Hayden.

REPLY.

Dear Bro. Hayden:—I propose only a brief reply to the above. So far as argument is concerned, you relieve me from the necessity of saying much by confining your response to a single point. You still think that my first article "laid the authority for instrumental music" (among the Jews,) "in the *law of Moses*; and state that I have since "magnanimously surrendered" that position. I beg leave to say simply that in this you are mistaken; for I have known from my boyhood that the law of Moses says nothing about instrumental music in worship. If I had anticipated any dispute upon this question, I would have been more specific in my statement, so as to guard against such a mistake.

You ridicule the idea that "*God ordained* instrumental music" under the reign of David; and you ask me to prove "that God ever required of the Jews the use of instrumental music." Your phraseology somewhat changes the issue. I have not assumed that God "*ordained*," or that he "*required*" the Jews to make use of it. I only assumed that he *authorized* it, by which I mean that he gave them the *privilege* of using it. I gave as proof of this, the fact that "it was introduced by the *inspired* Psalmist, and received the subsequent sanction of *other inspired* men." Do you believe that David was inspired, and that the Psalms are inspired? Then by what authority did he introduce this element of worship, and command, in the Psalm, that the people should praise God upon the psaltery and harp and other instruments, unless it was by *divine* authority? If we had inspired men among us now, we could no more question their right to intro-

duce instrumental music in the churches, than we could the right of the apostles to do so in their day. But God's revelation to the Jews did not cease with Moses, as his revelation to us did with the apostles. He continued to speak to them through prophets, and all that these prophets enjoined or appointed, was no less divine than any of the statutes of Moses. Not only, then, was instrumental music divinely authorized, but when the Jews read in the Psalms, in a part of their Bible, the injunction "*Praise* him upon the harp &c.," they must have felt that they were divinely *required* to do so. I may now, therefore, go farther than I did at first, and assume that this act of worship was actually *ordained* by God through David the Psalmist, and prophets.

You make another attempt to put my argument into the form of a syllogism, as follows:

"God ordained instrumental music in the former economy:
He left it out of the Christian dispensation:
Therefore we should leave it out of the church."

Now that which you here intended as the major premise of a syllogism, on the truth of which you join issue, I have established beyond controversy; and, if your syllogism were correct in form, the conclusion would be established. But this is no syllogism at all.—There is no comparison of terms either in the premises, or the conclusion. The first proposition has not the least relationship to the other two. The premises are both particular, and the conclusion illicit. Have mercy on me, dear brother, and never frame such another thing, and call it mine.

Right here, let me state distinctly, for you seem not to have perceived it, that whether instrumental music was, or was not, divinely sactioned smong the Jews, does not in the least degree affect my argument. If it was not divinely sanctioned, it was, as I said before, an unauthorized innovation, an act of will-worship; and we would be imitating a Jewish *corruption* to adopt it. But my argument necessarily assumed no more than that it was *a part* of Jewish worship, authorized or unauthorized, and you admit that it was. Now let me again repeat that argument, that I may keep it before you in its own form, and challenge investigation of its merits.

"The fact that any part of the Jewish worship was discontinued by those who organized the Christian church, is a direct condemnation of it by the Spirit of God as unsuited to the new institution;

The use of instrumental music is an element of Jewish worship which was thus discontinued;

Therefore the use of instrumental music in worship is condemned by the Spirit of God, as unsuited to the new institution."

I sincerely regret that in this your last article, you did not take deliberate hold upon this argument just as it stands, and either expose the fallacy that lurks in it, or admit that it is conclusive. I verily believe that it cannot be refuted, and I again throw down the glove to any man who thinks it can be.

You say that you do not like to be represented as *defending* instrumental music. I only intended to represent you as defending it *against my argument.* I knew not whether to understand you as in *favor* of its use, or *opposed* to it. But I certainly did not, and do not now misunderstand you, as defending it against the charge of being antiscriptural. You say, that to your mind "it is self-evident that no divine legislation was ever made touching this subject;" and affirm that "Whether it would be wise to use the instrument in any case may be safely left to the brethren locally interested in the case." You also speak of it as a question of "prudence and social regulation."

In the paragraph which you mark with two significant hands, you deprecate the fearful consequences of my argument, if true. But why should you shrink from these conseqences? If "alienation, bitterness strife," &c., are to result from a "*sound* argument" with its "conclusion *vindicated*," showing that God and Christ, and prophets and apostles condemn a practice, are we, for this reason, to let that practice go unrebuked? Is brother Hayden the man to shrink from maintaining arguments which show such things, in order to avoid dreaded consequences? With all his gentleness, he is one of the last men to occupy such a position.

With you, I have "little doubt that our candid and discerning brotherhood will be able to come to judicious and correct conclusions in the premises;" and therefore I apprehend no such consequences as the above. I do not "assume the right to decide for them, or dictate to them;" I only assume towards every one of them, the right which they have toward me, the right to teach and exhort with all long suffering and forbearance. Some churches who started the use of instruments have already abandoned it. I expect that others will, and that they will do so not to please me or any other man, but to please God by doing their own duty. Most fraternally yours,

J. W. McGarvey.

Back Nos. of M. Harbinger wanted—1st and 2nd Extras of vol. 1st. (1830) or the entire 1st. vol. Any person having these and willing to dispose of them will address *this office* or E. J. Ferriss, Painesville, Lake Co., O.

MESSAGE OF GOOD-WILL.

Love to God and love to men are the two kinds of love which constitute the heavenly religion. Bearing a measuse of these, we propose to make six visits by the press during the months of this year to every one who is desirous of hearing what we have to say.

The "perfect love" of which we speak—part of it ascending from the bosom of the disciple to heaven, and part of it circling the earth seeking to gladden the heart of man, was made manifest by Jesus between his public introduction to the men of Judea at the Jordan and his reception at the right hand of supreme majesty from Mount Olivet. To learn of Jesus our Lord is therefore to learn the true manners.

Shall we live and labor with this model before us.

Picton, C. W., 22nd Jan., 1865. D. OLIPHANT.

☞ It is our purpose to issue each double number toward the close of the two months for which they appear.

*** Terms :—$1 per year, payable in American currency.

A FANTASY.

Once upon a golden summer,
In a garden grew some flowers,—
And I used to live among them
Half the dreamy summer hours.

Very radiant was their beauty,—
And the pure and spotless white
Of the creamy, waxen lilies,
Burned in splendor on my sight.

Weeks flew by; I went to view them,
But the garden croft was bare,—
All their glory had departed
With the icy Autumn air.

Flowers are types of earthly pleasures—
Hopes that arch the soul with May;
For a moment thus they blossom,
Then forever fade away.

We should plant in higher gardens,
Where the skies are ever blue,
And the angels are the wardens
Of the Beautiful and True. B.

GOOD WORDS FROM OUR CORRESPONDENTS.

ASHLAND, O., March 6th, 1865.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—As a Missionary Evangelist for District No. 8, I spent the month of December at Cabletown, Champagne co.: a church that I started six years ago, continued five years with it a part of my time, having 125 members and a good house, and which was during the past 18 months of my absence almost annihilated by political jargon. I brought the brethren together, and had a very happy reconciliation! On the second Lord's day evening, the house was crowded. I immersed two soldiers, who had served their full term, passing through many battles unharmed. Money was raised to employ Dr. Clark one-fourth of his time. The Fulton Creek church, which had neglected their regular meeting for one year, was brought to recommence.

I have just concluded two months' labor in Dist. No. 16, speaking 86 discourses in 57 days—missing but three nights. At Harmony Grove, Guernsey co,, 2 immersed; at Millwood, Guernsey co., 3 immersed; at Palestine, Noble co., no additions; have had political troubles for a year past—a good meeting of one week. Bro. Sloan wrote me to go to Mt. Zion, Monroe co., 5 miles east

of Woodsfield church. Went down 8 years ago; tried to raise it 5 years ago, but failed. I made a fire, swept the house, and got to work. Staid 20 days. Gathered 24 members together, reclaiming 18 of them, and immersed 28—making 52 members; apppointed 3 Elders and 2 Deacons; assisted Bro. Glasier 3 days at his meeting in Woodsfield. He is a good speaker, and was well received. I have raised in contributions, &c., $113.00 for the District. The spirit of home missions is feviving. A good work is going on in that District, much over former years; I shall soon return to it. M. Riddle.

Bro. Pendleton:—It gives me great pleasure to communicate to your many readers in reference to the continual progress of truth in our growing State.—This seems to be the golden period for those who love the pure and precious gospel, to sow the seed and prune among the branches preparatory to the great harvest of the Lord. We now behold before us a building, partly royal and partly rustic. The fire is trying the materials which are to compose that eternal and entirely royal building of God. The workmen should ever be gathering the materials from the great world for the trial. Our brethren from the different parts of the State, report the following for February: K. Shaw, at Harrison, 141 added; A. Ward, in Sullivan co., 73 added; A. Atwater and J. M. Henry at Bloomington, 6 added; Jas. Blackenship in 11th District, 38 additions; J. M. and J. Henry and others at Bedford, 14 added; Moses Smith in Clark co., 33 added; Benj. Franklin at different points, 29 added; W. McIllvaine at Warsaw, 11 added; T. Lockhart in 5th District, 18 added: our beloved Bros. Grigsby and Edmundson, 22 added at Deer and Spring creek; J. K. Speer at Vincennes, 4 added. We call upon all the Lord's children to pray for us, and all in Indiana to aid our mission. In hope of eternal life,

Indianapolis, Ind. R. L. Howe, Cor. Sec. I. C. M. S.

Ottokee, Ohio, March 11th, 1865.

Dear Bro. Pendleton:—Knowing how cheering it is to the Christian heart to hear joyful tidings from the churches, I send you a brief epitome of the success of the ancient gospel in our county during the present winter.

The first meeting was held at Butler's Corners, by J. C. Goodrich and the writer—8 immersed. The second meeting with the Chesterfield congregation, by Bro. Goodrich and the writer—35 accessions. The third meeting held with the West Royalton congregation by Bro. Goodrich—31 added. At the same time a meeting was held in Wauseon by Bro. M. N. Lord, of La Porte, Ind., with 13 additions. Then a very happy meeting at Springhill, held by the writer—12 accessions. Next meeting at South Lenaca, by Bro. Goodrich, with 9 additions, and then a second meeting at Butler's Corner's, with 7 immersions—making 115 accessions to the church the present winter. L. L. Carpenter.

Bro. Pendleton:—We organized a church of Disciples at Corry, Pa., the 5th of March, of 12 members. A Free Will Baptist preacher united with us, and also an immersed Methodist. Prospect for a large church flattering. A fine house of worship, at an expense of $10.000, will be erected at once. This is the result of missionary labor, under the auspices of the A. C. M. Society.—Bro. Geo. W. Yost is the leading disciple at this place.

March 9th, 1865. J. F. Rowe, Agent A. C. M. S.

COLLAMER, O., March 9th, 1865.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—We have been favored with the labors in the gospel, eleven days past, of our affectionate and beloved brother J. O. Beardslee, late of Jamaica, now of Akron, O.

His manner of preaching was admirably adapted to our condition. His clear, earnest, affectionate and forcible style swayed the large audience like a great wind moving a forest. Eight confessions in baptism, and three recovered tnto a happy union in Christian fellowship, are the immediate fruits of the meeting. Yet the chief good of the meeting is doubtless the great increase of the spirit of piety, unity, and good will. A. S. HAYDEN.

ROCK TOWER, Jackson co., Te., March 6, 1865.

BRO. PENDLETON:—In January of this year, I visited the friends in Monroe and Cumberland cos., Ky.. again, and my feeble efforts resulted in the addition of 7 persons to the church; 3 by immersion; 3 were reclaimed, and 1 was added by letter; and better still, 8 noble souls covenanted to pray regularly in their families. In hope of better times, I remain

Your friend and brother, A. SALLEE.

ABINGDON, ILL., March 11th, 1865.

BRO. PENDLETON.— * * * By the blessing of our Heavenly Father, the school and church are both in a very prosperous condition. During the past winter there have been from 150 to 175 students in attendance: during the past few weeks, there have been 50 added to the church in Abingdon.

Yours fraternally, J. W. BUTLER.

ELKTON, Todd co., Ky., Feb 3, 1865.

BRO. PENDLETON:—I have just closed a meeting at Liberty, the county town of Casey co., Ky., resulting in the re-organizatlon of the church, and 15 accescessions—10 by immersion, 5 reclaimed. M. P. BAILY.

Bro. Baily, under date of Feb. 14th, also reports the re-organization of the church at Shady Grove, Casey co., Ky., with 27 accessions—16 by confession, 8 reclaimed, and three by commendation.

Bro. P. Galley, New Lisbon, O., March 14th, writes: "Bro. Wm. Baxter, of Cincinnati, has just closed a meeting of two weeks in this place, resulting in 18 additions by baptism."

OBITUARIES.

BRO. PENDLETON:—It is with feelings of the deepest sorrow that I record the death of our beloved young sister, Bibie E. Carlisle, of New Albany. She was the grand daughter of the late Elder John Baker, of Louisville, Ky., and second daughter of James Carlisle and Sister Ann M. Carlisle. Sister Bibie had just attended the funeral of her father, in Terre Haute, when she was called to attend the funeral of her aunt, Rebecca McPeeler, consort of Elder D. J. McPeeler, of Indianapolis; and while there, she was taken suddenly very ill, on the 13th Dec., 1864, and died on the 16th of the same month, in the 19th year of her age.

I was well acquainted with the deceased, and can truly say that she was one of the purest and loveliest of the daughters of earth. She became obedient to

the blessed Lord while I was laboring for the church in New Albany, in 1859 I believe, and immediately took her place in the congregation as one of its most devoted and efficient female members. We organized a young disciples' prayer meeting, and Sister Bibie was one of its leading members, always on hand and ready to take part in the exercises. She had a well balanced mind, and superior intellectual endowments. She was most able in prayer, and a good singer. I am not sure that I ever knew a young lady in whom all the Christian graces shone forth so conspicuously as in our dear sister Bibie E. Carlisle. She had great intellectual powers, combined with "the meekness and gentleness of Christ."

She was greatly devoted to her parents, and was always kind and obliging and respectful to all. Indeed, if she had any faults, we were not able to discern them. Her death was a terrible blow to her dear mother, whose whole being seemed to be wrapped up in the devoted child. We deeply sympathize with our dear sister in her sad bereavement, and pray God to sustain her by his grace.

Be patient, dear sister, for a short time, until the storms of life be overpast, and then you shall see the beloved Bibie again, clothed upon with immortality, and be permitted to join with her and all the blood-washed family, in singing the song of victory:

"O Death! where now thy sting!
O Grave! where now thy victory!"

Bedford, Ind., Feb. 20th, 1865. J. M. Mathes.

(Review and Record please copy.)

Died, in Somerset township, Washington co., Pa., on the 4th of Feb., 1865, Mrs. Elizabeth Burgan, in the 84th year of her age.

Sister Burgan was one of the original members of the Pigeon Creek congregation of Disciples, having come out from among the Baptists under the preaching of Bros. A. Campbell and Walter Scott, and was the relict of Elder James Burgan, whom many of the older brethren, who have visited Washington co., Pa., will still remember.

Again the hand of affliction has been heavily laid upon the family of our dear Bro. C. L. Loos, and taken from their midst one of its brightest gems—their youngest boy, Emile Kerr, aged 18 months. He was attacked by inflammation of the lungs, and after an illness of four weeks and four days of intense suffering, but perfect patience, his little spirit took its flight, on Tuesday, the 28th of February, at midnight. A little boy of classic beauty, we could not wish him fairer;—too fair for earth, he has gone to Him who said, "Suffer and forbid them not." P.

Bro. Pendleton:—My brother, James A. Maxwell, departed this life Nov. 25th, 1864, in the 24th year of his age, in Florence S. C. Military Prison. He was a faithful soldier of the cross as well as of his country. I never knew him to use a by-word or slang phrase. So choice was he in the use of language, that he always had a sound speech that could not be condemned. He lived and died a faithful Christian under the oppressive hand of the enemies of our government. May we be ready when called.

Parkersburg, W. Va., March 3rd. 1865. L. B. Maxwell.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 36.] BETHANY, W. V., *MAY*, 1865. [No. V.

SCYLLA AND CHARYBDIS.

The recent Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius IX has created equal astonishment and disgust throughout European Christendom. The same blind infatuation which sought to keep the world from moving by the imprisonment of Galileo, still seeks to arrest the progress of free thought by a bold reaffirmation of the worst doctrines of the dark ages. Liberty of conscience and of speech is denounced as the "liberty of perdition;" as "delirium;" and as "very hurtful to the safety of the Catholic church and of souls." There is a sad lamentation over that condition of society "in which the power of the laity is not compelled to inflict the penalties of law upon violators of the Catholic religion." It would evidently be very refreshing to the pious soul of this gentle shepherd, to hear of another St. Bartholemew's massacre! His perturbed spirit would be soothed into pleasant rest, by the delectable music of groans and and screams of anguish, from a few thousands of helpless victims of Inquisitorial malice! The King of Dahomey could scarcely howl more dismally at the stoppage of human sacrifices in his dominions, than this successor of St. Peter over the decadence of the spirit of intolerance in Roman Catholic countries, and the cessation of imprisonments, tortures and deaths with which the official minions of his predecessors were wont to pursue all heretics and recusants. The Encyclical also furnishes the following instructions to bishops and priests:

"And do not omit to teach 'that the royal power has been established not only to exercise the government of the world, but above all for the protection of the Church, (St. Lent. Epist. 156, al. 125,) and

that there is nothing more profitable and glorious for the sovereigns of states and kings, than to leave the Catholic church to exercise its laws, and not to permit any to attack its liberty; as our most wise and courageous predecessor, St. Felix, wrote to the Emperor Zenon. It is certain that it is advantageous for the sovereigns, when the cause of God is in question, to submit their royal will, according to the established rules, to the priests of Jesus Christ, and not to impose their will upon them.' (Pius VII. Epist. Encycl. Diu satis. May 15, 1800.)"

We feel a serio-comic impression, as we listen to these solemn croakings of a night-bird in the full blaze of noonday. An ostrich weary of pursuit, runs its head into the sand, and thinks itself safe! And this bewildered champion of a decayed hierarchy, dazzled by the light of the nineteeth century, plunges into the thickest medieval darkness, and vainly hoots and croaks at the light! The Pope will be compelled to awake from his dream, and renounce his infallibility. The world *does* move, and he must move with it, or be moved out of the way. This last missive is an overdose of absolutism even for the Catholic governments of Europe. France has interdicted it. Spain protests. The emperor of Austria shrugs his shoulders. Italy puts it under ban. The students of the University of Naples have publicly burned it at the foot of the statue of Giordano Bruno. Even among the Cardinals it is becoming evident that the document is distasteful. The real victim of delirium will be found to be the Pope himself, who, really reduced to a mere shadow of temporal power, still imagines himself entitled to all the honors of the triple crown, and raves about the rights of holy mother church, the vassalage of kings and emperors, and the blind submission of the nations to his will, as if he still walked amid the triumphs and wielded the scepter of Gregory VII.

If any thing can be more astonishing than the publication of this Bull, it is to find it accepted and endorsed as of divine authority by Archbishop McCloskey, of New York. To see a document, so hateful even to the Roman Catholic population of Europe, flaunted in the face of this Protestant nation as divine, and its reeking fumes of decayed superstition and tyranny welcomed as proofs of a divine *inflatus*, surpasses all comprehension, except to those who, deeply versed in the spirit and aims of Popery, understand her immutable devotion to the one great end of politico-ecclesiastical supremacy.

This leads us to remark that while we are amused with the comical side of this performance, we must not forget that it has also a serious and alarming side. These are not simply the ravings of a deluded old man. Rome is not entirely destitute of master minds. The cunning of Jesuitism is not exhausted. The political and religious condition of the nations is probably better understood in the college of

Cardinals than anywhere else. And the very fact that such a document is thrown in the face of this century, and is publicly endorsed in the United States, indicates a confidence on the part of the devotees of the Papacy, in their ability to play a bold game for the recovery of power. The facts submitted in the February number of the Harbinger, by Bro. Loos, of the bold and successful strides already made in our own country to secure the political recognition and support of Romanism, deserve to be seriously pondered. We place along with these, the fact that in Protestant England this power is pushing its conquests with astonishing success. In 1830, there were but four hundred and thirty-four priests for the whole of England; now there are twelve hundred and forty-two. The churches have more than doubled in that period. The convents have increased from sixteen to one hundred and sixty-two. And there are fifty-three houses of religious men where, in 1830, not one was found. These facts indicate a powerful growth of Roman Catholic sentiment in Protestant countries, as the facts previously noticed show a considerable decay of the same sentiment in Catholic countries. We shall not be surprised if there yet arises, in Protestant lands, a stubborn conflict with the doctrines of absolutism in church and State—a conflict for which, in our own country, our very incredulousness is preparing the way, while the fullness of liberty in which we rejoice is blinding us to our danger.

But we are also called to contemplate another and opposite movement in the religious world. While on one hand we are startled at these unblushing assertions of high ecclesiastical supremacy over nations and rulers, we are at the same time compelled to stare at the developments of Rationalism in the old world and the new. There is a painful discontent in Protestant ranks: a loss of veneration for her established formulæ; a refusal to accept the creeds of two hundred years ago; and an anxious search after something more satisfying than the dogmatism and formalism of Protestant creeds and ecclesiasticisms. Dr. James McCosh, in an address before the Evangelical Alliance, in Edinburgh, July, 1864, says significantly: "It is evident, at a glance, that we live in an age of inquiry, in an age of restlessness, in an age of discontent with the past, in an age of transition to something worse or something better. The day of the medieval reaction is obviously past among all our young men in the Protestant church. The cry is now for an onward march somewhither. * * * We cannot, if we would, shut our ears to the sound, which has become loud enough to wake the most sleepy, to disturb the most contented. * * * It is conceded that every community of mankind must have a religious faith and fellowship, and that all attempts to

interfere with this must recoil on those who make them. But alongside with this admission, there is an attack, vigorous and sustained on the creed of the past—in some cases on Christianity, as having served its purpose and now become antiquated; but more frequently upon the old forms of Christianity, more especially as embodied in the formulas and confessions of every church. * * * Our independent youths proclaim that our forefathers had no right to impose their creed on their descendants. Our advanced spirits boast that, having reached manhood, they have outgrown the boyhood of the race. As the result, we have a general discontent with the old, a cry for reform, and an expectation and prediction that something new and better must appear."

The appearance of such works as the Essays and Reviews, and those of Colenso and Renan, indicate a marked revolution in the public mind, especially in view of the great popularity of these books and the ferment they have occasioned. There is an evident rebellion against the ecclesiastical assumptions and theological dogmata of Protestant creeds; and an effort to gain larger freedom and a more reasonable faith. But these anxious multitudes, in breaking away from their old moorings, are venturing out on unknown and perilous seas, dreaming of the discovery of a new continent, but in reality drifting away among the icebergs of a treacherous rationalism. They are seeking a God without personality, salvation without a Mediator, revelation without a Bible, fellowship without a church, and immortality without the shadow of a hope.

Thus we have the two extremes. Blind submission to the church, and a forced adherence to her unreasoning dictates; the prostration of the soul, in abject servility, before a politico-ecclesiastical tyranny, in unlimited obedience to the voice of the Pope as the voice of God. Over against this, we have presumptuous human Reason exalting itself against the Word of God, snapping every tie that binds the soul in reverence and trust to the divine authority of the holy Scriptures, dashing to the dust every barrier that the church of God erects against lawlessness, and thrusting every spirit forth into a Christless freedom to follow the lead of its own intuitions, and to regale itself upon the thinnest moonshine of atheistic or pantheistic philosophy.

This modern phase of infidelity may also cause a conflict in Protestant lands. It is not at all likely to gain a permanent triumph. It is too negative and too abstract for that. But meanwhile it can make sad havoc with the faith and piety of this generation. If it cannot elevate the faith, it can certainly exalt the *pride* of the human heart. If it cannot minister to hope, it can strengthen the lawless passions of our nature. If it succeeds in breaking the fetters of human author-

ity, it breaks at the same time the restraints of divine law—leaving the soul to sport recklessly in a boundless freedom, and then sink hopelessly in an endless night.

Between these extremes lies the true course of the church of God. Here is to be realized the true mission of Protestantism. We are not at all surprised that there is much anxiety to know how to steer in a safe course, so as not to be dashed on the rocks of this popish Scylla, nor drawn into the whirlpool of this rationalistic Charybdis. One thing is certain. The leading minds of the Protestant world are becoming conscious that they cannot hold the people where they are; and that, to provide a remedy against the prevailing tendencies to drift away to the two extremes we have pointed out, Protestants must themselves awake from the dreams of the Past, and look the living Present in the face. They must let the dead Past bury its dead, and arise and follow Christ. It will not do to laugh at the stupid brayings of Pius IX, sounding hoarsely out from the recesses of medieval superstition, and then continue to repeat with an equally perverse stubbornness, the Athanasian creed or the Augsburg confession; or reaffirm, in willful disregard of the change of times, the doctrines and polity of the Westminster Confession—born amidst philosophical conflicts and political strifes which have as little to do with this age and country as the False Decretals, or the scholastic squabbles of Thomas Aquinas and John Duns Scotus. They must not grow indignant at the Pope's interdiction of freedom of conscience, and at the same time insist on every man's swearing by their denominational formulæ. They must not protest against a return to the traditional authority of holy mother church, and yet cling, with death-grip, to the traditions of apostolic succession and infant rantism—the tawdry remnants of Romish arrogance and superstition. It surely is not seemly to make merry over the pompous pretensions of the present imbecile Pope, and tauntingly remind him of the strength and glory of his predecessors; when our own decaying ecclesiasticisms are only less dangerous because less powerful, and only less pretentious because broken into fragmentary feebleness by the perpetual increase of sects.

All this is felt, and beginning to be confessed. "In these times of searching," writes Dr. McCash, "we have to give up some few things which our fathers believed in, which we ourselves revered in our youth. But, is it for the good of religion that we should stand up for all that has been alleged to be Christianity—for all that is traditional? * * * This is not a time to fight for additions which theologians may have made, on the pretense that they are buttresses of the

truth. I for one do not feel that I am called on to fight for the supplements which men, even great and good men, have made to divine truth. * * * This is an age in which God seems saying, 'I will overturn, overturn, overturn,' which signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. I do hope that by these collisions and rubbings, some of the sharper and more bristling points of our traditional belief may be ground down. Keeping our Bible as the Word of God, we may be restrained from interpreting it in so narrow a spirit."

We do not think it probable that the Protestant *fleet* can successfully sail, in these stormy times, between Scylla and Charybdis:—Their old log-books are useless. Their charts are erroneous. They have on board too much contraband material, of such a quality as to urn the needle from its integrity. Thick mists are gathering about them, and their pilots are confused. They will have to abandon their denominational craft, and return to the Old Ship Zion, where the Divine Chart alone is regarded, and where "the truth as it is in Jesus" will guide them safely through the perils from which their philosophico-theological creeds cannot deliver them.

"We are arrived, I rather think," says the author already quoted, "at an era in the history of the church—an era when Christians are called to review the condition of the church in general, and what is more difficult, to review the condition of their own sect. Let me ask, Is the professing church of Christ in the state in which it ought to be; in the state in which you should like it to be? I rather think that the answer of every one will be, that it is not. * * * I am cherishing the expectation that, in front of a formidable enemy, Christians of different evangelical denominations may be made to combine, first in action, then in spirit and sentiment, and, in the end, in fellowship. I am convinced that God has some great purpose to accomplish by allowing this restless feeling to spring up, this understood combination to be formed against the church."

These are refreshing utterances. It is cheering to think that some among the leading minds of the various denominations are beginning to understand. We respectfully suggest that a return to the divinely enunciated elements of unity, would free the Protestant churches from their embarrassments, and enable them to realize the freedom, strength, and comeliness essential to a successful prosecution of the spiritual warfare of this age; namely:—"One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one Body, one Spirit, one Hope, one God and Father of all."

I. One Lord—Jesus Christ, whose will, as revealed in the New Testament, shall be accepted as alone authoritative; thus repudiating

all human leaderships, names, creeds and systems, as means or tests of union and fellowship.

II. One Faith—the faith concerning Jesus, as the Christ, the Son of God;—rejecting all other articles of faith, as being unessential to salvation.

III. One Baptism—the immersion of the believer, by the authority of the Lord Jesus, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;—casting away sprinkling and pouring, and the admission of infants, as traditionary encumbrances, fruitful only in strife and division.

IV. One Body—composed of all baptized believers, united in a common faith and hope and love, as children of God and disciples of Christ, thus overthrowing all denominational names, organizations and interests.

V. One Spirit—the Spirit of God, given to dwell in the one body, as the comfort and strength of the saints.

VI. One Hope—the hope of eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord; preparing us, through its inspirations, in the one brotherhood of Christians on earth, for the love and harmony of heaven.

VII. One God and Father of all—who will be over all, and in all, and through all, to protect, bless, and guide his united children in their glorious mission to enlighten and save the world.

We have called attention to these two extremes in the religious developments of the times, mainly to lead to a better appreciation of the position occupied by our brotherhood, as affording the desired vantage ground, alike over Romanism, Protestant Sectarianism, and Infidelity. It belongs to the advocates of Primitive Christianity to show, in word and deed, that there are "old paths" of truth and duty, of faith and life—equally removed from the extravagant assumptions of the Papacy, the flickering lights of Rationalism, and the confused medley of sectarian theologies and ecclesiasticisms which the Protestant world presents. Absolute submission—but only to God in Christ. Perfect freedom—but only from human authority; a freedom wrought and conserved by "the perfect law of liberty" which Christ reveals.—Perfect unity—but only in Christ, for Christian ends and aims. Generous diversity—but only where the silence of revelation secures it: where God does not, and man dares not, impose restraints. Implicit faith—but only in divine testimonies. Free inquiry—but always on the basis of of the revealed will of God.

Pride and prejudice may prevent even those who long for a better state of things, from acknowledging the force of this plea for a return to apostolic simplicity and integrity. But we are of opinion that if Protestants fail to come cheerfully to this divine basis of union, the

approaching judgments of God will drive them to it. They will give their idols to the moles and to the bats, in the day when the Lord arises to shake terribly the earth. Meanwhile, let us be encouraged, in view of the special demands which this age has upon us, to push forward the great plea for a return to the word of God, in letter and in spirit, in faith and in practice. I. E.

THE UNCORRUPTED PRESERVATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED IN THE MEETING OF PREACHERS, NEWBURG, OHIO, OCTOBER, 1864. BY A. S. HAYDEN.

Two questions, intimately associated, constitute the subjects to be investigated in this address:—1st, the authenticity; 2nd, the genuineness of the sacred Books of the Bible. In other words, the *identity* and the *purity* of the writings of the holy prophets of God, and the blessed apostles of Jesus Christ.

These questions, though nearly allied, are not identical. A process of proof which demonstrates that the books of the Bible were written by the persons whose names they bear, might not be convincing evidence that they have come down to us uncorrupted. And on the other hand, testimonies to show them uncorrupted, would not be logically demonstrative of their authenticity. It is to be admitted, however, that a line of proof showing satisfactorily that they have come down to us as first written, would scarcely fail to satisfy us equally that the books in question were actually written by their assumed authors; for this second proposition, relating to their purity, assumes as a primary and acknowledged fact that they were thus written by them; and it merely proposes to make it apparent that they have suffered no mutilation, no addition or change since they came from their inspired hands.

The topic, then, delivered to our hands to handle, is single; and yet while it directly and legitimately aims to establish the one, it will aid powerfully to confirm the truth of the other of the above named points of inquiry, namely, the authenticity as well as the genuineness of the Word of God.

Nothing can be more important than the inquiry herein proposed. Its purpose, and its effect, is to rescue the inspired oracles from all reproach of taint or impurity, to defend them from charges, blindly and often maliciously preferred to their discredit, that unholy and incompetent hands have suffered grievous and numberless errors to become incorporate with the sacred text, affecting so seriously its integrity as to render it unworthy of rational confidence.

Three propositions lie at the foundation of the subject of this address:

Prop. 1st. God revealed his *will* to man in human languages; which will is written in books by men whom he inspired by his holy Spirit for that purpose; viz., the prophets of the Old and the apostles of the New Testament.

This proposition rescues the writers from the charge of imposture.

Prop. 2nd. That we have the identical books which they wrote.—This refutes the charge of forgery.

Prop. 3d. These books, now in our possession, contain precisely what they wrote, neither more nor less.

This defends them from the imputation of corruption.

To the proof of the last of these propositions I am invited by this convention.

We propose to derive evidence for this vital truth from the following sources:

1st. From the Manuscripts; the written copies of the Holy Scriptures in the original languages, which have come down to us from a high antiquity.

2nd. From the versions and translations of the Samnite and other languages.

3rd. From quotations from these inspired writings found in the works of the early Christian writers, "the fathers," both of the Eastern and Western church.

4th. From arguments deduced from the history of these invaluable documents.

This investigation belongs to the department of Biblical antiquities called Sacred Criticism, and to the historic branch of that department. But it is partly historic, partly critical, and partly argumentative.—We are aware some may, at the end of this lecture, cry out, "too prolix." The learned in such subjects will exclaim, "too meager, too unsatisfactory." For this subject has innumerable ramifications and limitless extent. I will endeavor to consult completeness and perspicuity in conducting the argument, and yet avoid unprofitable details.

FIRST CLASS OF PROOF—MANUSCRIPTS.

It is certain the Holy Scriptures have not been corrupted in their transit to us from apostolic times, for numerous manuscript copies of them are in existence, in which there is perfect agreement in statement of fact, doctrine, duty; and which have, throughout, with slightest exceptions, the most exact and minute verbal identity of language.

These manuscripts are very numerous; some containing the whole

Bible, as the Alexandrian and the Vatican; some only the old Testament; some, the *New;* and many of them only parts of the sacred Books. They abound in all the ancient libraries of all parts of Christendom. It is worthy of special and emphatic remark, that while many of our most admired classics exist only in one, some in two or three, and others, as Herodotus, in some twelve or fifteen manuscripts, the Holy Scriptures are known and read in manuscripts counted up to many thousands. Griesbach collected for his most critical and admired edition of the Greek New Testament, three hundred and fifty five; and Prof. Scholz consulted full six hundred for his improved edition. Many of them have descended from the eighth, seventh, sixth, fifth, and fourth centuries, and some existed even earlier.

The Hebrew Bible—or Old Testament in Hebrew.—The Jews are known to have been most scrupulous in their regulation to secure entire perfection in the transcription of the sacred writings. These rules were many, and marvelously exact. Among these rules to guard against mutilations of their copies of the law and the prophets by the corroding hand of time, their Senate ordained that after a specified age, the primal exemplar, or copy, should be destroyed, depending on the consummate accuracy of the copyist. Owing to this regulation, most of the MS. copies of the Hebrew Bible run no further back than to the tenth century. Nearly all bear date, according to Dr. Kennicott, between A. D. 1000, and 1457: a few rare copies extend up to the seventh and eighth centuries.

Dr. Kennicott and Prof. Rossi, two most diligent and successful explorers in this department of Biblical research, collated eleven hundred and nine, for their printed edition of the ancient Testament.—The whole number yet collated, as stated by the London Cyclopedia, is fifteen hundred.

2nd. *The Samaritan Pentateuch.*—Here is a striking confirmation of the Hebrew of the Jews, coming as it does from an independent source, and from a people yet hostile to the Jews. No collusion to make or admit any corruption of their respective copies of the inspired originals, could possibly have occurred, for "the Jews and Samaritans have no dealings."

The first copy of the *Codex Samaritanus*, containing five books of Moses, was brought to Europe in the year 1620. It was purchased at Damascus in 1616, and presented to the library of the Oratorium in Paris. This Codex, traveling down to us by a separate and entirely independent route, confirms in everything essential, nay with a minute detail, the Hebrew copies of the Jewish Bible long known in Europe, and ever read in all churches.

3rd. But the most interesting and almost startling confirmatory evidence to be deduced from MSS., that the blessed Word has passed through the fiery ordeal of time uncorrupted, is derived from a source quite new and unexpected. It had long been a desideratum with scholars to discover a copy of the original Scriptures in the East, the far-off East, beyond the limit of the Roman, and even the Greek Church. This greatly desiderated event has transpired within the limits of the present century. In the year 1806, Rev. Claudius Buchanan, the prince of explorers into the religious condition of the eastern world, placed into the hands of European scholars *a Hebrew manuscript of the Pentateuch*, whose channel of transmission differs from the traditional routes both of the European copies, and of the Samaritan just noted. He obtained it from the black Jews of Malabar, who appear to be a remnant of that people dispersed from their own nation by Nebuchadnezzar. It had been preserved in the record-chest of a Synagogue in Malayala. It measures *forty-eight* feet in length, and about twenty-two inches, or a Jewish cubit, in breadth.—It contains one hundred and seventeen columns of writing, perfectly clear and legible, and is declared to be a most perfect specimen of the most ancient Hebrew MSS. among the Jews. This invaluable relic was presented by that eminent Christian and antiquary, to the library in Cambridge, London.

What a wonderful providence presided over the records of our faith! This new testimony, so fresh and convincing, confirms by its perfect agreement in every essential particular, the uniform and unvarying voices speaking forth from every quarter of the Christian world, and most propitiously and opportunely unites its voice in proof of the uncorrupted integrity of the holy Word of God, which is the foundation of all grace in this world and all glory in the next. Jew Samaritan, Christian; Europe and Asia contribute their stores, and yield a harmonious testimony to the credibility of the oracles of God. Thousands of tongues proclaim the inviolate purity of the records of our faith, speaking from all the principal cities, from all the great libraries of continental Europe, from the British Isles, from far-off Damascus—the ancient home of Samaritan learning—and still beyond; from India comes the same testimony, reserved in God's providence to add its powerful confirmation just when the enemies of the faith are most diligent in their efforts to overthrow it. Through all revolutions, comes intact the precious testimony. All things else have changed, and yielded to the corroding touch of time's devouring tooth. But here—miracle of miracles—are the uncorrupted records of God's holy men. To their divine testimony is given an immortality, a vital power—innate—preserving them in uncorrupted perfection in

the midst of universal corruption and decay. No other work of antiquity has come down to us with a thousandth part of the fullness and variety of proofs which combine to demonstrate the fidelity of the Bible.

Manuscripts of the New Testament, whole or part, are very numerous. Their number is unknown. Michaelis, according to authorities above quoted, has catalogued and described two hundred and ninety-two.—Bishop Marsh, one hundred and seventy-seven others. The justly celebrated Archbishop Manners Sutton, a most diligent collector of manuscripts, has enriched the library of the archi-episcopal palace at Lambeth with twenty-three such copies, some of them of great antiquity. Moscow, the ancient capital of Russia, contains fifty-five of these precious documents. The Russian is a daughter of the Greek church, and all these MSS. constitute a most formidable array of evidence to the utter discomfiture of the audacious claims of Romanism to be the only conservators of the true Word of God. These accredited transcriptions of the inspired originals are in safe keeping in all the great bibliothecal libraries of Christendom: they are in the British Museum, in Cambridge, Clermont in France, Upsal, Dublin, in the Bodleian library, Dresden, St. Germain in Paris, Hamburg, Moscow, and in Lombardy, and many other cities and countries.—The great Theodore Beza brought one to light which he found in a Monastery at Lyons, where once presided, about the year of grace 194, the most gracious Ireneus, one of the earliest and best of the "Latin Fathers." It is to be especially noted as one of my strong proof-facts, that Beza used this manuscript chiefly for his perspicuous Latin translation. His translation of this manuscript I have here before me. Its agreement with former, and with later translations is thorough and perfect throughout. Do we need more convincing proof that no changes in any wise affecting their integrity, have passed over the unveiled face of God's holy testimonies?

SECOND CLASS OF PROOF:—TRANSLATIONS.

We advance to the second branch of the argument, to show from versions of these originals into other languages that the will of God has been preserved to us inviolate.

It was a most beneficent providence that dispersed the Jews from time to time among all the nations of antiquity. That people, "unto whom were committed the oracles of God," carried the sacred record along in all their migrations. Thus all the principal nations became leavened with the primary revelation, and gradually the divine thoughts were transferred into the current speech of mankind.

The common language of learning, of literature and law before the

advent of Christ was the chaste and copious Greek. Into this language was made the first translation of the old Covenant. It was executed in Egypt about 280 before Christ; and like our own English version, it was made at the demand of royal authority. According to Josephus and Philo, Ptolemy Philadelphus, engaged seventy-two learned Jews, who turned the whole of the Old Testament, from Genesis to Malachi, into Greek. This translation I have before me. It contains all the books, and no more, that are contained in the Hebrew; and with a marvelous exactness of agreement. This Greek version—the SEPTUAGINT—so called from the number of the translators of it, is sanctioned by the highest possible authority; being the one generally quoted both by the Savior and his holy apostles; and being read for ages in the churches of saints where the Greek was the common language.

The most ancient, the most accurate, and consequently the most authentic manuscript of the *Old* Testament in Greek, is one brought from Philippi by two Greek bishops, and presented to King Henry VIII. They informed him that tradition reported it to be the identical copy owned by Origen, in the early part of the third century; that is, about the year 216. Queen Elizabeth presented it to her instuctor in Greek, who, desiring to secure its preservation, placed it in the Cottonian library. Wherefore in criticism it is referred to as the *Codex Cottoniansis*. This manuscript is of Grecian paternity; and was preserved in a Greek city, and it affords another demonstration of our indepenedence of Rome for the Holy Scriptures.

The number of MSS. of the Septuagint has never been ascertained. Dr. Holmes, according to the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, collated 135 for his celebrated edition of the Septuagint. The history of no fewer than *ten* of these is minutely given, of which two are in London, one in Leyden, two in Paris, one in Vienna, one in Milan, and three in Rome. The dates of these manuscripts run from the close of the 4th to the 7th century of the Christian Era.

Greek MSS. containing the whole Bible: the Alexandrian and Vatican.—The Alexandrian Manuscript, or Codex Alexandrinus, preserved in the British Museum, where it was deposited in the year 1763, consists of four folio volumes; the first three contain the Old Testament; the fourth volume comprises the New Testament. It was sent in the year 1628 as a present to king Charles the 1st, by Cyrillus Lucaris, patriarch first of Alexandria, then of Constantinople, by the hand of Sir Thomas Rowe, embassador from England to the Grand Seignior. Cyrillus brought it from Alexandria; whence its name. Respecting the origin of this celebrated manuscript a difference of opinion exists among the learned; some maintaining it to be a production of Alex-

andria, basing this opinion on an inscription on the MS. itself, written in Arabic, affirming that it was written by Thecla the martyr. Others on the authority of Matthæus Multis the cotemporary, friend and deacon" of Cyrillus, in a letter dated Jan. 14, 1664, declaring that it was written in one of the twenty-two monasteries of Mt. Athos.—The judgment of Thomas Hartwell Horne is probably to be accepted that it was written in one of the Grecian monasteries of Mt. Athos, obtained there by Patriarch Cyrillus on his journey from Canstantinople to Alexandria, carried to the latter city, and thence to the seat of his Patriarchate, whence he sent it by embassador Rowe to king Charles. This Mt. Athos is situated on the extremity of a singular promontory, projecting from the Eastern shore of Macedonia. Among and at the base of the mountains of this promontory are many monasteries,—(Horne says twenty-two; twenty-six, according to the London Cyclopedia;) inhabited by Grecian monks. These monasteries were a prolific factory of manuscripts, written by these monks, whence many were sent to Moscow, and other places all over Europe. Now whether the Alexandrian MS. was written at Mt. Athos, or in Egypt, it is the work of Grecian hands; and this fact is especially to be noted as a complete refutation of the arrogant claim of Romanism, that we are indebted to the church of Rome for the preservation and the transfer to us of the holy oracles of God. The most thorough research assigns to this MS. a high antiquity, at least as high as the latter half of the fourth century.

A beautiful fac-simile of this precious relic has been published in England at a cost of £30,000 sterling.

The *Vatican* MS. next claims our attention. This, like the codex Alexandrinus, contains the whole Bible. They are both of inestimable value. They have traveled entirely different routes in their transit to us from the earliest ages of the Church. The Codex Vaticanus is lodged in the library of the Vatican palace in Rome, while the other is contained in the British Museum. According to Horne and other authorities, it bears equal date with the Codex Alexandrinus—being the production of the last half of the fourth century.

It must be borne in mind that we are not writing a disquistion on this most extensive subject; but in a very discursive manner we are leaping over the mountains of historic lore, and adapting the manner of treatment to the purpose of a general lecture. We pass over, therefore, the Greek translations from the Hebrew of the Old Testament by Aquila, Theodotian and Symmachus—all executed in the 2nd century,—and merely refer to the Syriac, the Peschito, (exact, literal, faithful) made in the 2nd century; and also to another important accession to biblical literature made by the late Dr. Buchanan, already

mentioned; viz: The entire Bible, old and new, in the Syriac character preserved in one of the churches of the East. This work, invested with such startling interest, is now in the great public library in Cambridge.

Here, in these two Syriac versions, we have two more columns of evidence, adding immense weight to the proofs already adduced for the purity of the Sacred text. For these, coming from Syria tell the same sublime story, though coming to us in channels of their own, having no intersection with the route through which have traveled the Hebrew and the Greek of our present authorized version.

Continuing our line of proof from ancient translations, the Latin should not be omitted. In process of time as the Grecian empire passed to decay, and the Roman extended the arms of its power, the Latin language supplanted the Greek. The Roman conquest pushed the language of that vigorous and victorious people over all countries: —hence the necessity of a transfer or translation of the *thoughts of God* into the popular language of the Roman world. Several versions were made, of which the critic historian, at his leisure, takes due notice. But all were absorbed at last in the more complete work of Jerome, of Rome, about the close of the 4th century. It is called the Vulgate. It was translated by him from the Hebrew, as the earlier Latin versions were from the Septuagint of the old, and the common Greek of the New Testament. The Vulgate displaced all preceding Latin versions, and rapidly rose to universal use in the Western, or Roman Church; much as our King James' version became general, and displaced the earlier English versions of Tindale, Coverdale, the Bishops' Bible, the Genevan, and that of Cranmer.

Now this vulgate translation is a complete demonstration both of the authenticity and purity of the books of the Bible; for both the Old Testament and the New agree in it with our common English Bible, from Genesis to Malachi, from Matthew to Revelations.

Thus the most careful, critical, and extended research accumulates the most unequivocal evidence of the perfect integrity of our holy Bible. All languages, Hebrew, Samaritan, Syriac, Greek, Latin; All countries, from Britain on the West, to distant Malabar on the East; All churches, Syriac, Armenian, Greek, Roman, Russian, Anglican, bear one and the same unvarying and unmistakable testimony to the proposition affirming the uncorrupted transmission to our times of the holy oracles of the blessed God.

It is to be especially noted that each language, each translation, each country, each church bears its own perfect and independent testimony. All these have the whole Bible, and all have the same Bible. Each has transmitted the good word of God through a channel of its

own; and thus each stands in some sort as a separate and independent monument; sustaining the inflexible integrity and the immaculate purity of the divine testimonies. And if each great community of Christians finds sufficient ground for faith and hope and love in the perfect and complete testimonies in its own possession, what must be felt to be the overwhelming fulness and force of the union of all the manuscripts and all the translations, confirming one another by a very minute and almost miraculous consent and unity. Is it objected that the process of collation has brought to light numerous variations in manuscripts, and many errors which have crept in from time to time into the translations:

We reply:—true, indeed; but of what character are these spurious readings; what their weight? Ten thousand of them would not amount to the weight of a grain of sand in comparison with the mountainous weight of evidence derived from the wonderful agreement which prevails among them all. Precisely such variations have been taking place in our own standard literary works, without prejudice to the excellence or the exactness of the language or the subject. No two editions or *recensions* of Cæsar's Commentaries are the same. Inumerable variations, of ten-fold greater magnitude, than any yet discovered in the holy Scriptures, are known by all scholars to exist in that history of the war in Gaul: yet the body of the work is quite the same notwithstanding. And the same remark applies to all the classics, with modifications in its force.

THIRD CLASS OF PROOFS—QUOTATIONS.

Shall we ask patience for a paragraph on the subject of quotations from the early Christian fathers.

Origen of Alexandria flourished about the year 230, that is, the earlier part of the third century. In his works are quotations from all the books of the New Testament, except only 2nd and 3rd John.—His failure to quote these is no disproof of their genuineness, for he made quotations as does any modern writer, in his homilies and commentaries just as he had occasion, and without any intention to make a list of the sacred books. His quotations are extremely numerous and full. In four volumes of his works, examined by the laborious Lardner, are found no fewer than 1353 quotations from Matthew alone. In all the four volumes they number 5768.

Ascending up the stream of time thirty years we come to Tertullian. In his works, as counted by the same diligent author, Matthew is quoted 290 times, Mark, 28; Luke, 430; John, 175; and thus each book is enumerated:—in the whole New Testament are found 1802 quotations. In Clemens of Alexandria, who flourished A. D. 194, 389

quotations. Ireneus was Bishop of Lyons A. D. 174. He was the disciple of the martyr Polycarp, and Polycarp of the apostle John. In his works yet remaining are found 767 distinct quotations, drawn from *every* book of our present New Testament save one only, the 3rd epistle of John.

And none of these, nor any others, ever quote any book or writing as authority but these now known as the inspired writings of the apostles. So ends all the clatter about other books being in existence in an early day, and being held in equal estimation with the books of the New Testament. They quote no apochryphal books whatever; a clear proof that they knew them not, or despised them.

But these are quoted on all occasions, appealed to in all controversies as ultimate authority and are by all classes and all parties reverently recognized as the inspired records of God's will to our lost and sinful race.

EDUCATION.

Of all the philanthropic enterprises of the present age, the effort which has been in progress for a number of years last past throughout the civilized world, to secure to every child the most ample facilities for an early and systematic mental and moral culture, seems to us the most beneficent and important.

To this end the onward march of science and art, and the solemn oracles of God, through revolving centuries, have steadily and uniformly tended. For the accomplishment of this object—the universal education of mankind—the noblest spirits of the race have labored in every age; and succeeding generations have reaped the imperishable fruits of their exertions and sacrifices.

Not until the human mind has been enlightened by true knowledge; not until the intellect has been properly cultivated and improved, and every affection, passion, and emotion of our nature disciplined and refined; not until the dark cloud of ignorance, error and delurion has been dissipated by the light of truth, can the mysterious promlems be solved, as to our earthly and immortal existence; our material and spiritual nature; our relation to time and eternity; our duties to ourselves and to God; our connection with the transitory incidents of the passing hour, and their illimitable expansion, throughout the ceaseless cycles of eternity!

He who is instrumental in reclaiming the least of these immortal spirits from the thraldom of ignorance; in unfoldidg its vast capacities; in elevating it from the sordid things of earth to a clearer con-

ception of truth and duty; in bestowing upon it the power of thought and reason, shall obtain a greatness before which the lurid glare of human fame, in its hours of highest triumph, shall grow dim; and the humble and devoted teacher, who, all unknown and unheeded by the busy world, calls around him his little flock, and imparts to their guiltless and unperverted minds those fundamental principles of knowledge, by which their whole future existence is to be guided and directed, is infinitely more to be honored than all the conquerors, who have imbued the earth in human blood, and reared triumphal arches of glory upon the crushed and ruined affections, and outraged rights of humanity!

O teachers, residing in the North, South, East and West, how high, how honorable, how beneficent, yet responsible, is the mission you are called upon to fulfill! What vast capacities are confided to your care; and how imperfectly are your labors and trials, your devotedness and sacrifices, comprehended or appreciated! But be not discouraged; it will not be so always. You have nobly, disinterestedly, magnanimously chosen, and future time will not fail to vindicate the wisdom of your choice; to honor your sacrifices; to cherish your fond remembrance, and to hand down your names as the true benefactors of mankind!

C. J. KIMBAL.

GOLCONDA, ILL., April, 1865.

QUESTIONS ABOUT PASTORS AND TEACHERS.

BRO. PENDLETON:—I have read and reread with pleasure and satisfaction your article in the Feb. Harbinger, entitled Pastors and Teachers. It seemed to me that the present state of public mind among the brethren demanded such an article. Similar thoughts I doubt not, have been presented by the editors and correspondents of the Christian Baptist and former volumes of the Harbinger; but the old thoughts in a new dress will be read with renewed interest.

The article, to which I allude, is concise, and seems to me *clear*; yet there is difference of opinion as to your meaning. To ascertain this as well as to elucidate the subject still further, permit me to propound the following queries:

1. What constitutes an elder, or what is it to "ordain elders"? Is there something in the "ordination" which inducts a man into the office, and without which he is not an officer?

2. What constitutes a pastor? You may think it strange to ask this question after reading your article; and it is strange in a certain sense of your words. But I am persuaded that all do not attach the

same notion to the word "pastor," and hence there is a difference of view in respect to some of your sentences. You say, "a pastor is an elder contemplated in the relation of a shepherd to a flock." "A man may be an elder, and not a teacher or pastor, in the special sense of these words; but he cannot be *officially* a pastor or teacher without being an elder. The last clause is ambiguous by reason of the difference in the use of the word pastor. I take it that you apply the word to a man who has been formally "ordained" to the eldership, but receives the appellation of pastor from the fact that he "feeds the flock," looks after its spiritual welfare. But the title "pastor," grows out of the *work* which a man performs, and not out of his office.—Hence a common view is that when a man performs the work he is properly denominated "*pastor*." Now with this view they will read your sentence, "he cannot be *officially* a pastor or teacher without being an elder." But they say he is a pastor because he performs such and such work, therefore he must be an elder.

You use the term "officially." Do you imply by this that a man may be a pastor *unofficially?* What is it to be a pastor in such sense, if such be your meaning? Some say if a man *officiate* as pastor, he is one *officially*, and thereby becomes an elder. Is such your meaning? If not would it not be better to discard the word *officially* and say if a man is pastor *at all*, he is one officially, and if not one *officially*, he is not one at all? The whole question may be stated thus: When a congregation employs a man to labor in "word and doctrine," to "feed the flock of God," and he does this work chiefly, is he for that reason either a pastor, or an elder without the process called "ordination."

3. Is it the *official* duty of the elders to discipline members "who have been overtaken in a fault"? Or does it belong to the church as a body to do it by selecting a committee of persons from its number to investigate the case? I have met with persons maintaining the former view, and with some who hold the latter. In support of the latter position 1 Cor. v. 4, 5. and vi. 4, 5. have been quoted. What is meant by "delivering such an one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the Spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus?

What does Paul mean when he says, "Set them to judge who are the least esteemed in the church." In what sense are they the least esteemed? Why are they to be chosen?

I perceive I have been quite diffuse, but it has been for the sake of fully bringing out the points. The querist's department adds interest to the Harbinger, and an answer to the above will be read with interest by many readers.

W. W. Hayden.

Pompey, N. Y., April, 1865.

REPLY.

1. Your first question makes two points, which we shall answer separately. First, "*What is it to ordain Elders?*" We answer, after the persons who are to be ordained have been chosen by the members of the congregation, upon due notice the congregation assembles with prayer and fasting, and the chosen are solemnly dedicated to their work, and invested with its authority, by the imposition of the hands of the Presbytery, or of an evangelist. The precedent and authority for this, we find in Acts vi. 6; xiii. 3; xiv. 23; 1 Tim. iv. 14; v. 22.

Second—"*Is there something in the 'ordination' which inducts a man into the office, and without which he is not an officer?*" Questions of this kind ought not to be answered with too much confidence, because *logically*, we are authorized to affirm a particular contrary where the matter is contingent;—that is to say, if "ordination" is a contingent and not a necessary qualification to this office, then one may enter upon the dischage of the duties and accept the authority of the office without ordination. Now it is unquestionably true that the Scriptures no where affirm that one may *not* be an elder without ordination; and as they have not affirmed this proposition, neither will we, lest we should appear to be wise above what is written. But this we will affirm, that in all matters of divine appointment, there is a strong presumption that the matter which is divinely prescribed, is *necessary*;—that is to say, that the qualifications and forms divinely prescribed, are necessary in the sense of invariable prerequisites to the office or privilege which is *formally* dependent upon them. This we think is generally true of all positive statutes, and is the ground upon which we reject the unbaptized. A departure from the rule of this principle, if it does not evince that the essence of official character is wanting, at least justifies the charge, that the proceeding is disorderly and unscriptural, and therefore to be avoided as dangerous and wrong. While then we would not affirm that one who has been duly called by the suffrage of his congregation to the office of an elder, and upon this ground alone has entered upon his duties, without ordination, is not an officer,—we do affirm that we have no positive scriptural warrant for saying that he is; and even granting that he is, by force of his recognized position and authority, really and truly an officer, nevertheless, he holds his place in disregard of a divinely appointed form of induction to it, which none who reverence the authority of the Word can encourage or approve.

There might be a case, in which a President elect of the United States might be called upon to exercise the functions of that office for a time, without having previously complied with the constitutional form of inauguration,—but no one could justify a willful neglect of the

constitutional requirement, or say that it was right to disregard it, except under an imperious necessity. So in the case of elders. There may be circumstances under which for a time persons elected by the congregation may exercise the rights and perform the duties of elders, without ordination, but such cases are manifestly departures from the general rule of Scripture, and ought to be corrected as soon as practicable.

We have had cases in the history of our government, in which an illustrative parallel is afforded to the one we are now considering. For instance, certain official appointments of the President have, according to the constitution, to be confirmed by the Senate. Now it has happened that appointments of this kind have been made in the recess of the Senate, and under the exigencies of the case, the party appointed by the President entered upon the discharge of the duties assigned him. But subsequently the Senate rejected the appointment, and he was recalled. His acts during the time he served were valid; but the official right was terminated by the refusal of the Senate to confirm.

So in the case of Christian elders. The people elect—but the presbytery or evangelist confirms. In doing this they are not to act as a matter of course, but upon conviction that the persons elected possess the scriptural qualifications. *They are to lay hands hastily on none.* They must make a careful inquiry into their fitness before they ordain, and should the result of this inquiry prove that they are unfit, they should refuse ordination. But if this refusal does not prevent the person so rejected from becoming an elder, then we make void the law, and introduce confusion into the constitution of the Lord's kingdom.

We know that there has been a good deal of irregularity in the practice of our churches on this point of primitive order. Our motto has been, "apostolic precept or example;" but we have not always strictly followed it. This however is no reason for continuing in the disorder. Our duty, as sincere reformers, requires us to reform our own course as well as that of others, provided we discover it to be erroneous. When Apollos was taught the way of the Lord more perfectly, there would have been no excuse for him, had he continued in the old way. We doubt not, much of the incompetency of our elderships would have been avoided, had our elders in all cases been subjected to the judgment of a presbytery, and required to assume the solemn consecration of ordination, before entering upon the discharge of their duries. Let us consider this matter, and set in order the things that are wanting.

II. "What constitutes a pastor?" If this question looks to the manner of choosing the pastor, we answer, it is to be done by the free

suffrage of the congregation. If it looks to the manner of appointment, we answer, by prayer, fasting, and the laying on of hands, because he is only one of the elders, with a special work assigned to him. He is not a pastor *officially* till the office is conferred upon him in this way by the congregation. If a man by force of his Christian character and zeal, performs voluntarily and without official appointment the work of a pastor, he is *virtually* a pastor; but he cannot do this in an organized congregation without some kind of formal and official action;—for the duties are such, that one uninvited by the congregation cannot assume them to himself, without a a violation of good order. If a private member were to undertake to "rule" the congregation as an elder, we would clearly call it a usurpation;—so, if such an one were to undertake the pastoral care of a congregation, it would be equally an assumption. Pastoral labor is a part of the duties of the eldership—and officially none but elders can or ought to assume it. A president judge is not a judge because he is president, but he must be a judge before he can be a president.—An "elder that rules well," is not an elder because he "rules," but he rules because he is an elder and is fit to rule. So a pastor is not an elder because he is a pastor, but a pastor because, being an elder, he performs that special work of an elder which is expressed by the term pastor. Elder is generic, expressive of official rank; pastor is specific, expressive of a particular work pertaining to the office.—*He is an officer because he is an elder, but a pastor because, being an officer, he watches over and feeds the flock.*

You will see then that I do not think one can be a pastor *unofficially* without assuming a disorderly course. To say that "if a man *officiate* as a pastor he is one *officially*," is a mere play upon the ambiguity of the word *officiate*. In its strict sense, only an officer can *officiate*.—The verb expresses the action of an officer. When, then, a congregation employs a man "to labor in word and doctrine,"—"to feed the flock of God," he is not for this reason alone either a pastor or an elder, but should, to perfect the official title according to the Scriptures, be approved for the office by the judgment of the presbytery or Evangelist, and then consecrated by prayer and fasting and the imposition of hands, to the duties to which he is called. This is Scriptural order, and we should uniformly conform to it.

III. We think there can be no reasonable doubt on this subject. The Elders should discipline the members of the congregation This is clearly implied in the qualifications which they are required to have; in the expressions which are used in connexion with their office; and by the established usage both of the synagogue and the primitive church. A Bishop must be one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity: for if a man

know not how to rule his own house, how will he take care of the church of God?" "Let elders who rule well, be counted worthy of double honor;" "remember them that have the rule over you;" "Obey those who rule over you, and be submissive; for they watch for your souls, as those who must give account;" "Salute all them that have the rule over you" &c. Now these passages have no meaning,—they are the merest nonsense, except upon the ground that the elders administered the discipline of the congregation.

In the case referred to in 1 Cor. v. 4, the judgment was given by the apostle Paul himself. The elders had no discretion in the matter. The case, as a fact, being made out, Paul announces the law, and there was no appeal. In the case described in 1 Cor. vi. 4. we find a very common exception to a general rule. It is clearly an arbitration of a controversy, about some special mattter that required the judgment of disinterested parties, who were acquainted with the law or custom in the case. Many such cases may arise, in which the elders may be very poorly qualified to judge. They are not moral or spiritual questions, but questions of legal and customary right, that only those who are acquainted with the rule in the case can decide fairly. Such cases should be arbitrated by select brethren, rather than carried to the courts of law.

We understand by "delivering such an one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh," that the apostle meant for him to be excommunicated, that through this discipline he might be reformed.

Those "least esteemed in the church" were the pagan judges before whom these questions were carried for judgment. (See 1 Cor. ii. 6-8). They were not members of the church at all. The apostle declares their conduct in appealing to parties "whose wisdom comes to nought" and whom they thought to be in darkness and sin, to be to their shame. He does not speak imperatively, but declaratively, and in the tone of astonishment. "Know you not that we shall judge angels? Much more then things pertaining to this life. If, then, you have controversies pertaining to this life, do ye set them to judge, (i. e. pagan rulers) who are the least esteemed in the church! I speak to your shame."

We might elaborate these points at much length, but we trust the hints we have given will suffice for those who are disposed to think so closely and earnestly on them as from your letter, I judge you and others interested with you are doing. Accept my assurances of a most cordial co-operation with you and all the Lord's people in searching into the teachings of his word, and in attempting to carry on our begun work into a perfect conformity in all things of faith and practice to the divine standard furnished us in the precepts and examples of the New Testament. W. K. P.

AUSTRALIA, OR THE FAR SOUTH.

ADELAIDE, SOUTH AUSTRALIA, Dec. 26, 1864.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—As you are so kind as to inform me, from time to time, through the pages of the Harbinger, what you are doing in what was once called the New World, I will, in return, give you some idea of what has been, and is still being done in the now newest world, *i. e.*, Australia. I am thankful to say that although we have been threatened by the Autocrat of Russia with a sudden and unexpected descent upon our coasts, in the event of a war with England, we have heretofore enjoyed the blessings of peace. Thankful would I be could I say the same with regard to your unhappy country. I fear from the resolute determination of both North and South to gain their ends, that it will be long ere the olive branch will be held out by either. Here, in this fertile and fruitful land, we literally sit under our own vine and under our own figtree, none daring to make us afraid. Our harvest, about an average one so far as is known, is just being gathered in; our vineyards are loaded with fruit—the fig, the almond, the olive, and nearly every kind of tropical and intertropical, is ripening for use, those growing in temperate climates having been for the most part gathered in. With a climate which will produce in various localities—in the cool and elevated hills, the well-watered valleys, and the warm and sunny plains—the productions of so many climes, you will say, perhaps, that we ought to be truly thankful and truly happy; but what we are and what we ought to be are two very different things. Any stranger visiting our little metropolis, would at least conclude that we are a very religious community; in fact, some ignorant and eccentric individuals might imagine from the evident desire there is manifested by most of our denominations for large and fine places of worship, that "these be thy gods, O Israel!" The importance attached to the possession of these places, and the gratification they appear to afford, have led to the adoption of the most beggarly, unscrupulous and unscriptural means for raising the necessary funds. Bazars, sales of fancy articles, lotteries, tea-meetings, sewing-meetings, begging men, begging women, and begging children have, with several other schemes, been tried with greater or less success; and to such an extent has even gambling been resorted to in the neighboring colony of Victoria, that, to the disgrace of Christianity, or rather what is called Christianity, the Legislature has actually passed a law for the punishment of gambling as practiced in some of the plans opened for the purpose of raising money for professedly religious purposes. So you will perceive that with us, instead of the church being,

as it ought to be, the light of the world, the world has had to reprove the church; or, as some would say, Satan has had to reprove sin!—Amongst a people who attach so much importance to the mere shell or the externals of religion, you may imagine that our simple ideas about such things are not very popular or palatable. It is almost vain, or labor in vain, to attempt to teach the people that God has now no material temple or tabernacle on earth; and that no building, however costly or imposing, can now properly be designated the house of God;—since our bodies are now scripturally the only temples, and the household of faith the only house of God on earth. What are we to conclude is the almost inevitable consequence of all this regard to externals, and the forgetting and neglecting of the weightier matters of the law? I see it to be the sure road to formality and infidelity—a possession of the form but a denial of the power of Christianity.—Being disengaged on Lord's day evening, of late, and hearing that one of our most popular preachers was about to deliver an address to *young men* on the *antiquity of man*, I entered the handsome building where the preacher referred to displays his eloquent oratory to a throng of admiring hearers. The beautiful building, which has cost about 40,000 dollars, and will cost some 10,000 or 20 000 more before it is finished, was brilliantly lighted with gas, showing to the best advantage the elegantly moulded ceiling, and the chaste cornices and pilasters represented as supporting it. In front of the preacher (or lecturer, as he might be termed) was a large, well-bound Bible, with gilt edges, for which the lecturer professed a great regard; but I gathered from his address that the book of nature was just as reliable a source of information as to the age of man, as the good old Book we have been accustomed to believe in. From the ignorance this learned gentleman manifested as to the contents of the Bible, I concluded it was placed before him more for ornament than for use; and that by-and-by there would be a shelf made for it, or a niche in the wall, where it could be pointed out to the next generation as a relic of antiquity worthy of such an honored position, but by no means to be depended on since science had made such wonderful revelations.—Fancy a sire of the present generation directing the attention of a young Australian to the sacred relic, somewhat as follows:—"That, young man, is a book which your great grandfathers believed to be a revelation from God, and that it furnished them with the chronology of man from Adam (supposed by them to be the first man whom God made) down to Christ; but since then you must know the sciences of Geology, Ethnology and Philology have been so fully developed, that it can be proved beyond a doubt by each and all of the three sciences I have named, that instead of man being, as the Bible led your

grandsires to suppose, nearly six thousand years old, he is more likely thirty, forty or fifty thousand years old." Fancy, further, the offspring of this enlightened age hearing such a statement, and regretting that the good old people who had been so credulous in the past age, had not lived in the one possessing so much light and knowledge [I am sorry to add, that the preacher I have referred to is not the only individual occupying a leading position in our community, who is leavened with semi-infidel notions regarding the antiquity of our race, as well as its origin.] From the foregoing, you will perceive that the mystery of iniquity which has been, and still is, so busily at work on the Continent of Europe as well as in the old country, is slowly but surely undermining the faith of many, be that faith only in this or that ism or denomination. In view of the assaults now being made upon the truths of the Bible, by its professed friends as well as by its avowed enemies, it appears to me to be very important that all who stand up as proclaimers of the gospel should make themselves well acquainted with the facts, precepts and promises which the blessed Book contains. "Facts are stubborn things," and however men may deny the facts of the Bible, we know that those who are saved can alone be saved by believing these facts; all these facts depending, as it were, on the one great fact that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God." Turning from the subject which has occupied so much of my letter, I will mention a fact which I feel sure will be interesting to you, and to others who rejoice in any accession to the number of those churches who endeavor to walk according to the commandments and ordinances of the Lord. I intend to mention the following fact because it reminded me of a scene I witnessed at the Dutch Fork about ten years since, during my visit to Bethany, and which I have remembered with pleasure ever since.

Having been invited a short time since to visit a part of the country about twenty-five miles distant from my residence, for the purpose of immersing three or four candidates for Christian Baptism, and forming them, with others, into a church, I proceeded, by mail, accompanied by a Christian brother, to the residence of a brother in the locality. On arriving late on Saturday evening we found a brother busy preparing seats, &c., for the morrow. After supper a lengthy conversation with the husband of one of the candidates resulted in his determination to be buried with Christ in his appointed way, making the fourth to be baptized. On Lord's-day morning, as the hour drew near for the first meeting, the people were seen wending their way round the sides of the hills, from different directions, some on foot, some on horseback, and some in vehicles of various kinds. It was soon found that the room which had been prepared and seated

for the occasion, would not hold half the assembly, and hence, as at the scene I witnessed at the Dutch Fork, I suggested the necessity of giving my preliminary address in the open air, and accordingly, with the canopy of heaven above us, we raised a song of praise to our Creator and Redeemer, with His material and spiritual workmanship around us and in our very midst. After a short prayer, imploring the assistance and blessing of the Lord in and upon what we were about to attend to, I delivered an address founded on the Gospel preached by Paul to the Corinthians, which he summarized as follows: "That Jesus Christ died for our sins according to the Scripture, that he was buried, and that he rose again according to the Scriptures." These three grand foundation facts of the gospel, taken in connection with the fact that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God, occupied our attention for some time; and we then informed the congregation that if they would proceed to the spot selected for the immersion they would see the three great facts of the Gospel we had proclaimed to them reproduced in the professed death unto sin, burial with Christ, and rising again of the candidates we were about to immerse. We then proceeded to the creek, and in presence of the people assembled on the banks, and under the shade of two gum trees, we, by the authority of Jesus Christ baptized those who had publicly as well as privately confessed their faith in Christ, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. As we knew the attendance upon this ordinance would be a novelty to many, and had an idea that it would be misrepresented by others, we were particularly careful, as usual, to show that we did not believe in salvation by water; that immersion in water was only figurative salvation, as taught by the Apostle Peter, and as any one must know who was at all acquainted with the facts of the Gospel. I have found this plan of presenting the truth concerning baptism a wise precaution, as, at the very outset it disarms those calumniators who, if they can, will charge us with believing in, and practising water salvation. We stated, therefore, that while believing the Scriptural statement that baptism is "for the remission of sins," it could only be regarded as signing or sealing to us the blessings of the great salvation. We showed that Jesus, the Christ, is "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," and that the "blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, cleanseth from all sin;" that, consequently the washing with water was but a typical cleansing and a figure of that salvation secured to us by the death, burial and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. Abraham, the father of the faithful Gentiles as well as the natural parent of the Hebrew family, received circumcision as a "seal of the righteousness which he had being yet uncircumcised," that he might be the father of many

nations; and faith, the apostle Paul affirms, was imputed to him for righteousness prior to his circumcision. To Abraham circumcision was but a sign, the thing signified being the "cutting off" of his sins; and it was shown that baptism was but a sign, the thing signified being the washing away of the sins of the penitent believer in the blood of Christ. It was also shown that faith in the thing signified and shadowed forth in baptism was absolutely necessary; as, without this faith there would be the shadow only, without the reality; hence no benefit could accrue to infants or unbelievers who are destitute of that which alone can constitute baptism a sign or seal of salvation. An individual seeking or claiming the title deeds of property, the possession of which he has not obtained, and has no right to, would be considered guilty of fraud; and in like manner the title which many claim for, and give their children to, salvation is obtained by fraud, and is, to all intents and purposes, invalid.

In the afternoon some eight or ten of the company who had been buried with Christ in baptism, met to break bread, and to show forth the Lord's death according as he had himself appointed. After attending to the other duties which devolved upon us as a church of Christ in a collective capacity, the meeting was opened for inquirers, and for about an hour we endeavored to answer such questions as were submitted, mostly with reference to believer's baptism, which was something new to the people of this locality. Each time I visit this part of the country I find a goodly congregation assemble to hear the words of life. I have immersed five, and others I think are considering the matter. There are several little congregations in different parts of the country witnessing for the truth, and though my labors are mostly in and about the city, I take great pleasure in witnessing and taking part in these rural assemblies.

I must now conclude, but will endeavor to address you again ere long. Yours in the faith, H. Hussey.

P. S. I omitted to mention that brother Earl, who has been laboring as an evangelist in England for some time past, and who, I think came from America, has arrived in the neighboring colony of Victoria and has commenced his labors there.

"Cast thy burden on the Lord, and he shall sustain thee." "This" said Henry Martyn, "is the text I carry about me, and I can recommend it to every one as an infallible preservative from the fever of anxiety."

A little wrong done to another is a great wrong done to ourselves.

NEW TRANSLATIONS—NO. 2.

H. T. ANDERSON'S VERSION.

"He that builds by the wayside, has many masters and critics"; this very suggestive proverb Luther repeated in a letter to a friend on the subject of translations of the Bible, and in explanation and defense of his own. The architect has to endure the ever-ready and easy criticisms of every passer-by; and how much easier it is to stand by as judge, find fault, praise, or give advice, than to undertake ourselves the work that we essay to judge,—the mature fruit perhaps of years of the patient thought and labor of learning and of genius!—To translate the Bible, or even the New Testament, is a work of great magnitude. In reading, in the letter above referred to, the frank statements of the great reformer, of all the difficulties, the trials and labors that had to be endured by him and his co-adjutors in translating the Bible, we confess that all our sympathies are awakened in behalf of these patient toilers in their long, high and generous task; we have a truer idea of what it signifies, and feel humbler in undertaking to judge and criticise any such work of real merit.

We repeat,—it is surely a high ambition to undertake to give to any *one* of the nations of the earth a translation of the whole or of any part of the Bible, that can in any high degree be called good.—To accomplish this may well awaken the noblest ambition in the soul of the devout Christian scholar, who in all true humility feels himself, by the divine aid, fitted for this exalted task. But the Book of God belongs to no one man; it is His gift to all alike,—to Jew and Gentile, to the wise and the unwise, to the Scythian and the barbarian, to the bond and the free; the translator assumes his work not for himself, but for a people, and for generations. Great then is his responsibility both to God and to man. He offers himself by his very act to the fullest critical judgment of those whom he assumes to serve, and whose approbation and acceptance he seeks and claims. This is inevitable; it is most just. For men will say, "Who has required this at your hands?"—and this reasonable question must have a reasonable answer. If the work is well don , it will confer an unequaled blessing upon the world, and crown the author with an enduring fame; will rear for him "a monument more enduring than brass," or the undecaying marble that mocks the waste of time. If badly done, severe and just censure will follow. Let every one, then, that offers to the world,—especially this great and enlightened world of our day,—a new translation of the Word of God, for which he claims attention and precedence of excellence, feel the high stand and the

great responsibility he has assumed. There have been periods when men could believe them elves called upon by a mighty voice, as from heaven, to do this service for man; and men have judged them in their works in love, and blessed them. Such a one was the reformation period in the old world. Such periods will be again, and such a one, we are free to believe, is ours, in the deciding of the great question,—alas, that it should be a question!—whether men here and everywhere should have a true translation of the Word of God.

We have made these remarks to justify free and full criticism; and because, furthermore, there does seem to us to be undue haste to accept the important gift of a translation, without, and before, calm and patient criticism, because it is the work of a brother, and has been for some of its real excellencies, recommended here and there. To this, speaking for ourselves, we cannot consent; and we appeal to the just and deliberate reflection of every intelligent Christian man for the correctness of our position. This is too great and too serious a matter to be carried through in this easy and ready way. In judging of a translation of the Holy Scriptures, we look only to the sacred, divine treasure before us;—we know no man; we know only the truth of God, in the immensity of its solemn import to the world. Fraternity, brotherly love, personal esteem,—all, have no weight here. We therefore approach this question, with reference to man, the translator, with all freedom, refusing to be brought, in this respect, "under the power of anything"; but toward God, with all reverence, submitting, "leading captive, every thought to the obedience of Christ." Bro. Anderson's work is not yet accepted; it has not yet passed its trial. Whether, as a standard translation, it shall stand or fall, is yet to be decided; nor will the kindness or liberality of the brethren decide this. A higher tribunal must pronounce the verdict. Patient, thorough, and competent examination, on the part of many, uninfluenced by aught but the supreme law of truth, alone will speak the final word of acceptance. Let there be no haste. Let there be no pressure; for all this will avail nothing at last, and will not be allowed by an enlightened public.

In assuming to criticise the translation before us, we are gratified to know that we have to do with an enlightened Christian man and a scholar, who, with the liberality of a mature, cultured mind, we trust not only allows, but even desires and solicits a free, full and generous examination of his work. Narrow, uncultivated minds, with an egotistical conceit, repel every approach of the critic of their productions, demanding a sacred 'noli me tangere'—*don't touch me*—reverence for their works, and regarding every decision against the latter as a personal, irreverent assault on themselves. With such men no-

thing can be done. To deal with a liberalized scholar, however, is a cheerful and a hopeful task; especially when he is a devout Christian, and when the inquiry is about the Holy Scriptures, before which translator and critic bow in humble reverence, laying all pride and self-esteem before it in the dust. In dealing in any manner with the Word of God, our spirits should be imbued with profound humility, and should only move in pious reverence in our investigations and judgments. As the translation in its motives, its spirit and execution, so also the criticism, in its spirit and purpose, should be sanctified;—the spirit of God should be in both.

We have read with much care and attention the translation before us, and have sought to arrive at a correct judgment of its character and merits. It is, however, in harmony with our appreciation of the value of our own judgment in this matter, to say, that the following criticisms are offered more as suggestions than as authoritative decisions; and we shall neither be surprised nor chagrined to have any of our opinions proved erroneous. We add,—to go into a thorough investigation of this book is what neither our time nor space will permit, even did we feel competent to it; we are necessarily limited to a general review.

Bro. Anderson's translation is a contribution to sacred literature for which we owe him all thanks. There is plainly revealed in it much thorough knowledge of the Divine Word that could only have been obtained by many years of close and devout study of its holy pages. There is evidence that the translator has not passed negligently over any, even the easier portions; and that he has toiled faithfully to discover the meaning of the Holy Spirit in the more difficult passages. The permanent impress of labor is upon the whole work. It is not a difficult matter to see the difference in such cases between an unripe and hasty, and a mature and patient judgment. There is manifested also, every way, a ripeness of scholarship in the original language, that we are confident will claim and receive the respect of scholars, and will well bear the tests of searching criticism. The translator, whatever even serious defects may be discovered in his work, will not be put to shame. We feel it our duty and our pleasure to give the author this due credit and praise.

The author's sound scholarship and long and patient study of the sacred text have enabled him, in very many passages to bring out the sense of the original much more fully than it is in the Common Version. This is true generally of the work,—from the beginning to the end of it. We do not design to give any illustrations of this from the many at hand; some important passages in this class we purpose to examine in a subsequent article. The merit of this version which

we have noted here, as it gives a real value to it, ought strongly to commend it to the Christian public.

The English of this version bears the impress of much diligent care and of a well-cultivated, refined taste in the purity, the excellencies, and elegancies of our tongue. It runs along with remarkable smoothness, offering nothing that can offend the purest taste in this respect. This is the uniform character of its English style, sustained throughout the whole. In this particular it contrasts most favorably with the Bible Union version, which, we presume will lay very little claim to purity and elegance of style. But while we note and commend this general excellence, we freely say, that we think this polishing and smoothing process; this fashionable nicety of diction, may be carried too far here, especially when it is at the expense of the characteristc. more vigorous, even if more un-modern, un-fashionable, simple, and bold Anglo-Saxon style of the old Version. We suggest that perhaps, this translation is not always in this regard, a fair exhibition of the original. The language of the original does not reveal the polish of a statue of Phidias, *ad unguem*, where the nail could not detect a single inequality or break; it received not the smoothing process that an Isocrates or Xenophon would bestow on his works. Though never offending against good grammar and good taste, it was the mature, natural, unaffected, un-artificial language of true heads and true hearts moved from on high. Its great authors came not with "the excellency of man's speech." There are in the New Testament style the inequalities, the often bold and rude abruptnesses of nature; —all the diversities that the common dialect of man reveals. This we desire to see retained in any version of this wonderful book.— The introduction of a too fashionable, elegant style into the Bible, we think, is not to be recommended, as it is untrue to the divinely chosen and divinely adapted forms of the original, and tends to effeminacy,—to the loss of masculine force and vigor of thought and expression. We commend, and demand of all translators,—and we would almost say, all writers for the people,—the pure, bold, nervous Anglo-Saxon of Shakspeare, of Bunyan, and of the Common Version, as models in the past, to be imitated by a like style in the present.— We here record a general, though well fixed impression carried away from the reading of this new translation; yet it is characterized by a very pure simplicity of language; and we desire on this point more to praise than to blame. That it needs, however, the pruner's diligent hand and knife, and would be the better for it, we have no doubt.

What has been said in the preceding paragraph on the subject of a smooth, polished, rhetorical elegance, leads us to another important question in translation, to which we desire to call attention with ref-

erence to the book before us. The chief literary characteristic of the New Testament is the striking simplicity of its style. The Holy Spirit selected for its medium the common language of the common people. As the Greek was at that time the principal language of communication among the nations lying along the Mediterranean, spoken, as Cicero says (pro Archia), by almost all nations, it was chosen as the depository of the will of God. It was not the language of Demosthenes, Plato, or Aristotle; not the language of the classic writers and speakers of that glorious nation, but the more 'common' or 'Hellenistic Dialect,' so called because it was the form of colloquial and written Greek commonly used by the various nations that had adopted this tongue. Without discussing the general characteristics of this dialect, we state here only that in comparison to the classic Greek it was extremely simple. The "great words," the majestic march of the grand periods, sentence after sentence connected with, and involving, each other, like the columns of a great army;—the lofty and elaborated rhetoric of the Athenian forum, of the tragic muse, of the school of the philosophers, and of the great historians, are not to be found in the records of the evangelists and the Apostles. Here all is simple, all has come down to the level of our common humanity. God regarded the human as well as the divine in his communications to men; and hence chose humble, earthen vessels, who would by pen and tongue bear his message of mercy to man, that it might be glad tidings to all; that it might, without further human intermediation, be a "gospel to the poor," as well as to the rich, to the ends of the earth and to all generations.

Now, as this characteristic of the style of the New Testament is undoubtedly *designed* of God, it must, as a first and indispensable qualification be maintained in every version that is intended for the use of men. Nowhere else is there better reason for the application of the Latin maxim, "to avoid an unusual word, as the mariner shuns the rocks;" and it were well indeed, if in all language that is to convey general instruction to mankind this excellent rule were regarded. A translation, therefore, that in the choice of words, the structure of sentences, or in any other way, aims above the common level of the language of the New Testament, is at once to be rejected, as untrue to the original. In general terms it may in all truth be said, that such translations as Luther's and King James' in this respect are most excellent examples for imitation. "When I wish to know how to translate a passage," said Luther, "I listen to the people on the streets, and hear how they express themselves, and translate accordingly." This of course does not imply the use of vulgarisms.—The Revision of Luther's Bible, ordered by the Wirtemberg Bible

Society, therefore, wisely intends to retain the exceedingly simple and nervous style of Luther. We have had translations in various tongues, ancient and modern, that are not modeled in this respect after the original, and we presume were not designed to be. Such is Beza's Latin version of the New Testament, though most elegant and highly classic in its style, and in this respect far above the Vulgate,—yet perhaps not equal to the latter in imitation of the original. Such is the German translation in Lange's Bible-Work, intended only as a basis of critical exposition. Such is also Dr. George Campbell's Version, which we are sure was never by the author intended to be a translation for general use among the people. We take a few passages from the last for illustration; and we take these passages at random, without selection. We open in the 2nd chapter of Matthew and read, v. 16: "Then Herod, finding that he had been deceived by the magians, was *highly incensed, and dispatched emissaries*"; ch. 3. v. 7—"For thus we ought *to ratify every institution*. Then John *acquiesced*." Again in Mark, opening at random, we read, ch. 10, v. 24—"But resuming his discourse," &c.; v 28—"Then Peter took occasion to say," &c.; v. 41—"The ten hearing this *conceived indignation* against James and John," &c. These quotations might be multiplied endlessly. Now does not every one see the difference between these high-wrought forms of speech and expansions of the text, and the noble simplicity of the common version, true to the forms of the original? Examine these passages in our Bible and see. The language of Dr. Campbell is neither that of the New Testament, nor is it our 'common English.' It answers very well in the higher walks of literature and literary life, and there we do not object to it; but it is altogether out of place in a translation of the Word of God for all. We are very glad to be able to say, that the version we are reviewing has sought to maintain the beautiful, natural simplicity of the Word of God; at least, the offenses against this important characteristic of the language of the Holy Spirit, are not so numerous as might be expected, where we see everywhere the busy, skillful hand of the polisher. Much credit is due to the translator for avoiding as much as he has, the sin of 'high-sounding phrase, language of gods'—a sin that so easily besets the learned and half learned. We feel like honoring every man that is virtuous in this respect. All this is said, however, only of the general character of this version in this respect. It is *not* altogether free from the sin just noticed. We object to such forms as the following:—'Give a response,' Luke 22: 64. The common reader will not understand the intended meaning of this expression, as it is used chiefly of heathen oracles. I would much prefer even the word 'declare,' or some other plain term. 'And

tabernacled among us,' John 1: 14. The literalism and *critical* accuracy of this term will not justify it here, nor introduce it into general use. 'Dwelt' or 'sojourned' is true to the original, and is well understood, and will stand in general use. 'If I testify concerning myself, my testimony is not *worthy of credit*,' Jno. 5: 31. Besides being an expansion and *exposition*, rather than translation, of the *one* original word, for all which reason we object to it, this is a fine, polite phrase that is altogether unnecessary here, and quite untrue to the strong, bold, simple Hebraistic form, 'my testimony is *not true*.'—'And they found in him occasion for offense,' Matt. 14: 57; 'lewd actions' (often used); 'homage,' with other cases of like character, we feel like objecting to as a refinement not necessary nor true to the text. These are, however, only spots, of rare occurrence, and do not characterize the whole. But we recommend a reading of the book as the best attestation of what we have here said in its behalf.

But we have said enough for this number, and shall continue this review in the next. C. L. L.

ANOTHER SKPTICAL DFFICULTY.

Bro. Pendleton:—I have read with not a little intsrest and satisfaction, your reply to "Sincerity," in your last issue; also, your explanation of a few similar difficulties, in the preceding number. There is yet aaother matter, concerning which, if you will not think me tedious I will venrure to request an explanation from your pen.

I presume you will not deny that language is unstable, and liable to change and corruption; that words are constantly losing their primitive meaning and distinctness; also, that man is both wicked and fallible; and, as a consequence of the wickedness or fallibility of man, or both, innumerable errors in translating and transcribing, interpolations and corruptions of various kinds, have crept into the Bible.

Now, the difficulty which I would have removed, is this: If either intentionally or unintentionally, on our part, we are subject to the errors, interpolations and corruptions alluded to; and if words are continually changing and corrupting—continually losing their original signification and taking on new meanings—as history abundantly attests,—I say if this be true, then, Is human language a perfect medium through which for God to reveal his will to man? Might not such a revelation, through the changeful, evanescent nature of human speech, or else through the perverseness or imperfections of mankind, be entirely lost; or, at least, so perverted, and corrupted, and changed, as to render it valueless to the world? Would God reveal himself to man through such a medium? Sincerity.

Answer:—It is true that language is unstable, and liable to change and corruption; but it does not follow that these changes cannot be detected and these corruptions surmounted, so as to discover the authentic original and rise to the pure fountain of the revelation as it was first committed to the language of man. The language in which the greater part, we may say all of the New Testament was written has indeed undergone very great changes, so great indeed, that we are in the habit of calling it a dead language, but this does not prevent us from understanding it just as it was understood in the day in which the New Testament was written. We do not interpret the Greek of the New Testament by the Greek now spoken in Greece, but through the laws and usage of the language in the age in which the apostles used it. We will suppose a revelation made to us in this year of our Lord 1865 in our own vernacular. Certainly to us who now live and understand our language as it is, this revelation would be as intelligible and definite, as such a communication could be to such beings as we are. If it could not be made clear and definite to us in the words of our language, it could not be made so to us in any other way, and then we would have to come to the absurd conclusion that God could not reveal his will to us at all. Now suppose after the lapse of two thousand years our language should be found to have undergone as great a change as that through which we know the Greek language has passed. It is evident that if we were to attempt to interpret the revelation made in the present condition of the language through its altered form, we should not only misunderstand it, but in many cases fail to find any meaning in it whatever. But suppose that in this embarrassment, we were to undertake to study the language as it stood when the revelation was given, and that by dint of patient research, we could acquire a knowledge of it as accurate and precise as that of the ancient scholars who spoke and wrote it, would not this make the revelation as definite and intelligible to us, as it had been to them, and place us so far, practically on as favorable ground for knowing the will of God, as that of the people to whom it was originally delivered? This no one can deny—and this is precisely the case about which skepticism would insinuate a difficulty.

We ask the skeptic, If God cannot reveal his will through words, through what can he communicate with us? Will he answer? And if he reveals his will clearly in the language of one age and people, and empowers all succeeding ages to know and understand that language just as it was known and understood at the time the revelation was made, what matters it so far as their knowledge of his will is concerned, whether the language has subsequently undergone changes or not? Will the skeptic show us the difficulty?

We have no hesitation in affirming that human language is a perfectly adequate medium for communicating all that it is essential for man to know concerning the will of God. It must be noted, too, that it is not special and set words and phrases that God reveals, but great and commanding ideas, which take possession of the mind, in no matter what variety of words they may be expressed; and in the midst of all mutations and corruptions, remain ineradicable elements of human faith and hope. Besides this, much that is positive in fact is committed to symbolical representation, and preserved through other sensible signs besides words, and handed down in the institutions and ordinances of the church. So that Christianity stands out, a living exponent of its own divine origin and nature, and presents to every living inquirer an embodiment of the power and spirit of the ever-living Word. Let us illustrate by baptism. We have the *word;* and the meaning of that in the day of the apostles we can know and do know as well as any Greek to whom the language was native. But besides this, there are the metaphors by which it is defined; and added to this, the historical exhibition of its meaning in the practice of the primitive church. So that if the meaning of the word were ambiguous, as a question of pure philology, we could still derive it from the other two sources to which we have referred. The metaphors of the Scripture would explain it, and the practice of the church would show it forth in living example.

What if the cunning and cynical skeptic does discover some little discrepancies in ancient manuscripts! Do they affect the foundation of the mighty temple, or mar the symmetry of its essential parts!—Give all such their fullest value and significance, and what do they prove! Specks upon the surface of a marble temple disfigure a little its silvery polish; but do they destroy the solid masonry, obscure the plan of the architect, or disturb the harmony of the grand design?—So with the system of revealed truth. Admit all the readings and print them bodily in the same text, and the glorious fabric will still stand out in its reality and truth, despite these trivial marks of corruption, which are only on the surface, and command the admiration and respect of all honest lovers of the beautiful and the good.

W. K. P.

A new periodical is about to be started at Rome, called *Journal of the Immaculate Conception.* A month's indulgence is promised as a premium to subscribers. The Pope has ordered the Congregation of the *Index Expurgatorius* to examine the Emperor Napoleon's Life of Caesar, for anything it may contain dangerous to the Church.

DEATH OF THE PRESIDENT.

Abraham Lincoln, the 16th President of the United States, is dead! Suddenly and without a moment's warning, he has fallen, by the hand of an assassin! The morning of the 14th of April 1865 rose upon him full of hope; and all that anxious day his head and his heart were busy and strong, in what he fondly thought would bring speedy peace and rest to our disturbed and weary people; and the evening found him, amid the gay and joyous throng of hearts beating free with a sense of mighty national agonies endured and ended, and lending the welcome of his presence to the happy signs of returning peace. But in a moment how all is changed! The deadly bullet enters the brain, so busy with the future fate of this mighty nation, and it is paralyzed forever! Soon the heart grows still, and the man of all eyes—for whose words thirty millions of people were waiting in hushed breath and with fondest hope,—whose single mind held the secrets that nations were trembling to hear, and upon whose fiat the fortunes of agriculture and manufactures, and commerce and even civil liberty seemed to hang,—he from whose lips we were waiting to hear the potent spell of *peace* sound over the troubled waves of our stormy sea, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, lies dead, and powerless to speak to us for good or for ill—as though he had never been. *He is dead and another ruleth in his stead.* If there be any events in which Providence seems to challenge the world to serious and awful consideration, surely this is one of them. For the last four years, who can have occupied so much of public attention as the man who, as President of the United States, stood forth, the representative of the mightiest military power on earth, in a storm of revolutionary conflict that seemed at times destined not only to drift the Christian world into war but to engulph in irremediable ruin the very temple of our political liberty. And now, just as this long and anxious struggle seemed about to terminate and we were looking for the answer of light and peace upon the face of this oracle of all the national wisdom in the cabinet and victory in field, to see it suddenly grow dark under the bloody hand of the assassin, and veiled forever in the night of a violent and untimely death,—the heads of nations must shudder under the shock of the awful disappointment,—and turn in their perplexity to God for wisdom and strength to read and bear the calamity of his providence aright.

Murder is a dark and damning crime no matter upon whom committed. If I maliciously or even wantonly take the life of the merest slavering idiot that barely vegetates in the light of life, I deserve to

die for it; but to murder a people's President!—this is to stab the nation's heart,—to trample under foot "the awe and majesty" wherewith God hath clothed the "temporal power," and count the people's choice an unholy thing. The crime is not to be measured by human punishment. It outweighs the wrath of man. We can but vindicate the law and leave it to Him, who hath said "vengeance is mine;—I will repay." Yet we know that for such, there is reserved the fire that is not quenched and the worm that never dies.

We are prone, under a great national blow like this, to ask Why God permitted it? and are apt perhaps to venture too boldly to anticipate its destined effects in the future; but we do not allow ourselves to enter upon the field of political conjecture. Let us rather look into our own hearts and see in this terrible national affliction a solemn warning to humble ourselves before the great Ruler, and implore more fervently and truly his guidance and protection. The Lord hath not smitten this people so heavily and thus in the moment of exulting hope, without reason. We need a purification, before the land can be fully blest. Let us inquire wherein we have come short and sinned before our God, and with true repentance fall down in the dust before Him, and he will surely lift upon us the light of his countenance and give us peace. W. K. P.

FOREIGN RELIGIOUS NEWS.

Russia.—The German Baptists are making efforts to carry their missionary work even into Russia. Mr. Oncken, the indefatigable leader of the Baptist Missions in Germany, visited St. Petersburg to intercede in behalf of the Baptists of the Empire. He has been favorably received, but is told that though everybody may believe what he pleases, and worship God, in accordance with his faith,—proselyting is strictly forbidden. At St. Petersburg, seven candidates were buried in baptism with Christ at midnight, and thus, says Mr. Oncken, "the first administration of the Lord's ordinance was accomplished in the imperial capital of Russia.

Mexico.—Pius IX has addressed a letter to Maximilian, in which he claims complete freedom of action for the prelates of the Mexican church, the control of all its property by them, and the "exclusion of every dissenting worship." Maximilian refuses to allow these high claims. He has granted free permission to the American Bible Society, to circulate the Holy Scriptures in any part of Mexico.

Africa.—On the West Coast of Africa there are some 150 church edifices: 20,000 are taught English; 20,000 persons belong to various denominations.

JUDSON AND THE REVISERS.

BY JAMES CHALLEN.

It is no idle task to give the Word
Pure, as from Him who spoke it first and sent
It to the world; the labor of one's life
Is summoned to the work, and worthy of
The best we have; the garnered fruit of years
Of toil and labor is laid upon the
Altar; the offering is approved by him
Who well deserves the best we can bestow.
They need a portion of that spirit which
Fell on Judson—Burmah's apostle! when
Through years of toil and suffering, alone
And friendless, without one heart of all he knew
Who understood his task or could assist
Him in it.

'Mid sultry suns, and weariness and want,
Through pestilence and famine, pain and woe,
And with a martyr's courage, still he toiled
On through the huge volume, word by word, and
Verse by verse, till the last jot and tittle
Of his mighty work was finished; and
Then he bowed his knees, with hands uplifted
To the heavens, holding the precious leaves
That bore the last "Amen" of him of Patmos,
Bedewed with grateful tears, and gave them to
The Savior: O man beloved! Ally
Of prophets, and all burdened souls who work
For God and for our race, I weep for joy
To think thy task is done: that prayer of thine
With grateful offering, 'neath the shady
Woods of Burmah, woke sympathy in heaven
Which finds an echo in all earnest hearts.
Glad was thy soul that day, as the meek dove
That bore the olive from the new made earth,—
Pledge of its future peace and blessedness.
It was the brightest day of all his weary
Life; the sweetest hour, unmixed with worldly
Hopes and fears, that ever came to Judson.
As a tired child, he lay his beating heart
Anear his Savior's, and was refreshed;—
"For so he giveth his beloved sleep."

DAVENPORT, Iowa.

O. A. BURGESS, COR. SEC. OF THE A. C. M. SOCIETY.

CINCINNATI, O., March 27, 1865.

PROF. W. K. PENDLDTON—*Dear Brother:*—Please say to the readers of the "Harbinger," that at the last meeting of the Board of the Am. Ch. Miss. Society, O. A. Burgess, of Indianapolis, Ind., was duly appointed Corresponding Secretary of the Society.

By order of the Board. H. S. BOSWORTH,
Rec. Sec. A. C. M. S.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind. March 27, 1865.

PROF. W. K. PENDLETON—*Dear Brother:*—Having accepted the Corresponding Secretaryship of the A. C. M. Society, permit me to say to your readers, that I desire all communications and documents of whatever nature, designed for that Society, to be addressed to me at this place. Also, all contributions designed for the Society, may be enclosed in letters and forwarded by mail with safety. Of these, permit me to hope the name will be legion, and the amounts large.—The work of saving men from eternal ruin, stands unquestioned as the highest in importance and the most glorious in results of any work ever submitted to man. The A. C. M. S. proposes to extend this work into fields uncultivated by any other organization among us, and give to the dying the pure waters of everlasting life. Other organizations "not of us" may give mingled waters—we must give the pure. The Society has already nearly twenty agents actively engaged in this glorious work, and they must be sustained, and if possible, twenty more added to the number. Send on, therefore, your money; send often—send much. Address,

O. A. BURGESS, Cor. Sec. A. C. M. S., Indianapolis, Ind.

☞ We are gratified to make these announcements. We think the appointment a good one, and hope to hear of a liberal response to the calls of this Society. We have felt strongly inclined to raise a voice of complaint at the poor return of liberality which the Report of the Society showed for the last year, but we knew so many apologies could be offered, that we concluded to forbear. But in all candor, dear brethren, let me ask, is not this matter a serious reflection upon our pretense of a missionary spirit! The liberality of the entire brotherhood is not equal to that which we might expect from one or two individuals among us. Bro. Burgess must rouse himself to wake us up from this discreditable indifference and poverty of spirit. W. K. P.

BIBLE UNION REVISION.

We call attention to the advertisement of the Bible Union on the 4th page of cover. No student of the Bible should do himself the injustice of neglecting this work of the Bible Union. We cannot read the Bible too much, nor in too many different versions. A version is to a certain extent a commentary;—since its expressing the thought of the original in different words, serves to define more narrowly the sense in which it is to be taken. We are not prepared to give any unqualified admiration of this work, but we can very cordially commend it as worthy of the careful and studious perusal of all who are anxious to understand more fully the precise revelation of the Word. We hope some time, we trust not very far hence, to see a version that will command sufficient authority with all unbiased Christians to secure a united co-operation in its circulation; but until that time comes, let us circulate the best we have, and thus help the gospel to run and be glorified. W. K. P.

A GREAT MISSIONARY FIELD.—FOUR MILLIONS OF PEOPLE CRAVING THE BIBLE.

Letter from Captain Benjamin Thomas.

FORT PINNEY, HELENA, ARK., April 9, 1865.

WILLIAM H. WYCKOFF, *Corresponding Sec'y American Bible Union.*

My very dear Brother:—Buried as I have been in the din of war for the last four years, and missing all mail matter, I had a real treat this rainy Sabbath morning. I found it in the *Bible Union Quarterly* for November, and in the Soldiers' Edition of the New Testament by the Bible Union, containing Galatians and Thessalonians.

The rain and water to-day prevented my preaching to my command and I felt that I could not better spend a part of it than by presenting the claims of these colored people who crave the Bible.

They learn to read very rapidly, and the clear type and paragraph form make it well adapted for them. They ought not to have the whole New Testament in one book. It costs more, and they will not take care of books as well as the educated white people.

These poor blacks can now have the Bible, for the first time, freely put into their own hands. They commit with great ease, and their quotations will be in better English than others who have learned from the old version.

This is the great missionary field for the Christians of this age.—Over 4,000,000 of people are in our country, nearly all of whom are

without the Bible and anxious for the truth. We love to Christianize the Karens, because they welcome us. The harvest truly is great, but the real laborers are few. I have had a life-long desire to be a missionary; and now I have the opportunity, while serving the Government, to do some missionary work at the same time.

We have a large Sabbath school here of 200 scholars, and I would like to put these little volumes in the hands of all who can read.—There are about 100 who could use them well. I could distribute on the plantations around here 200 or 300 more. I would be glad to hear from you. God bless the Union and its officers!

Your brother, BENJAMIN THOMAS.

We have sent 300 copies to our Brother Thomas. Opportunities are numerous for doing good to the multitudes of freedmen. We could distribute many thousands of copies immediately, if we had the means; and we earnestly desire the co-operation of all who feel interested in Christianizing and lifting up these millions from their ignorance and degradation. Help us, friends, in the good word. Aid for this object may be sent to

WILLIAM H. WYCKOFF, *Cor. Sec.*,
Or to C. A. BUCKBEE, *Ass't. Treas'r.*,
AM. BIBLE UNION, 350 *Broome-St. N. Y.*

ROME.—Cardinal D'Andrea, this able, highly educated and very wealthy prince of the Church of Rome, has openly and fearlessly declared himself against the tyrannies and stupidities of the Pope. To occupy a freer position he left Rome, and is now at Naples, where he has put himself under the protection of Victor Emanuel, the king of Italy so much hated by the Pope. He has taken a stand in favor of the abolition of the temporal power of the Pope. The journals announce that the Neapolitans will send him as their representative to the National Chamber of Deputies. This will be a very remarkable event, truly. The matter is exciting great interest in Italy.

The Pope's *Encyclical* is denounced all over Europe. The greatest, and almost the only favorable reception it has met with, is here in America, where Arch-bishop McCloskey, of New York, accepted it, and read it to the faithful with the fullest approbation.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE OHIO MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

The next Anniversary will occur May 23, 24, and 25, in Ashland, O. At this assemblage of Ohio brethren, we shall be glad to greet many from sister States. R. R. SLOAN, Cor. Sec.

MEETING OF THE AMERICAN BIBLE UNION, IN ST. LOUIS, MO.

To all who are interested in procuring and circulating the most faithful versions of the Sacred Scriptures:

The American Bible Union has made arrangements for holding a Special Meeting in St. Louis, Mo., on *Saturday, the 20th of May next*, in the Meeting-House of the Fourth Baptist Church (Rev. A. C. Osborne's), on the corner of Twelfth and North Market Streets. The exercises will commence at Half past Nine o'clock A. M., and continue (with the usual intermissions) through the day and evening.

The following speakers have been invited, and nearly all of them are positively engaged:

Rev. Thomas Armitage, D. D., President.
Rev. Geo. W. Eaton, D, D., Pres. of Madison University.
Rev. D. R. Campbell, D. D., Pres. of Georgetown University.
Rev. D. Pat. Henderson, Louisville, Ky.
Rev. Geo. C. Lorimer, Louisville, Ky.
Rev. Alfred N. Gilbert, New York.
Rev. William W. Everts, D. D., Chicago, Ill.

A Report of the Board will be read.

Wm. H. Wyckoff, Cor. Sec.

C. A. Buckbee, Rec. Sec.

Bro. Isaac Errett has just closed a deeply interesting meeting of two weeks with us here at Bethany. Bro. E. was visiting us on other business, connected with the interests of the church, but the brethren insisted on his preaching to us, at least at evening of each day. Besides much good done by way of stimulating the zeal of the members, sixteen souls were added to the congregation. P.

GOOD WORDS FROM OUR CORRESPONDENTS.

At the request of the brethren Phillips, who have located in New Castle, Pa., I spent three weeks in that place, in March, teaching and preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ. The previous labors of Bro. T. C. McKeever and others had prepared the way for a very favorable hearing. From preachers and people we enjoyed a candid and patient hearing; and, as far as I could learn, a very general approval of the positions and plea of the present reformation. It was a time for seed-sowing—and we have confidence that the God of the harvest will yet be honored in a fruitful

yield. We gave but one invitation, at the close of the last discourse—when two persons came forward and confessed Christ. The church there numbers about 20. Arrangements are completed for the erection of a house of worship on the best site the village affords, during the present year. From the zeal and ability of Bro. John T. Phillips, as a preacher, and the large-hearted liberality, enterprise and piety of all the brothers Phillips, and the brethren associated with them in the church, we cannot but hope for the upbuilding of a strong, influential, and efficient congregation in the capital of Lawrence county.

I. E.

IMDIANA MISSION.

Bro. Pendleton:—That the hearts of brethren may be cheered by good news from our "Home Mission," and the "Missionaries" everywhere stimulated to press on for the crown at the end of the race, I ask a small space in your welcome visitor to report the success of the gospel:—By Bro. Wm. McIllvaine, 17 added; by Bro. Spencer, 7 added; brethren Lord, Crane and others, at South Bend, 4 added; Bro. Lord and self at Warsaw, 22 added; Bro. W. S. Patterson in 2nd District, 34 added; brethren Grigsby, Leonard and Edmundson at Spring Creek and Delphi, 25 added; Bro. Geo. Campbell, 2 added; brethren Franklin and Adamson in 4th District, 5 added; by brethren Reese, Roes, Wheeler, Clendennan, Bowman and Lord in Ind. & Michigan Co-operation, 107 added: Total, 225. To the Lord be all the honor and glory forever.

In Christian hope, R. L. Howe, Cor. Sec.

Bro. Pendleton.—Good news is coming from all quarters of our State.—Bro. W. S. Patterson reports 103 added; Bro. McIllvaine, 7 added; Brother Blackenship, 84 aded; Bro. Floyd, 9 added; Fro. Hobbs, 55 added; Bro. Arnold, 35 added. Our prospects are brightening, and our glorious truth is triumphing. To the Lord be all the praise.

R. L. Howe.

Rock Tower, Jackson co., Te., April 4, 1865.

Bro. Pendleton:—After my second discourse at the Beach Grove, in the Turkey-neck Bend, Monroe co., Ky., on the 2nd Lord's day in March, 2 noble Baptist sisters came forward and united with the congregation of the Lord at that place, and another worthy young lady confessed the Lord and was immersed. The good cause is progressing in said Bend.

The church at Philomath is doing well. Bro. Gilpatrick with his family has located near the meeting house, and will preach for them twice in each month, if his health will allow.

A. Sallee.

Rock Tower, April 11th, 1865.

Bro. Pendleton:—I have just returned from Hills Chapel, in Monroe co., Ky. We gained one from the world, and one from the Baptists. Briefly, for your readers, let me state that, on the 2nd Lord's day in March, 1861, I delivered a discourse on Christian union, by the special request of the Baptist church meeting at Liberty Hill, in this county, some eight miles from this place. At the close of my humble effort, the church present, with their preacher, gave me the right hand upon the proposition that the Bible shall be our only ground of union and rule of faith and life.

On last Christmas day, by the consent of the Baptists in Tompkinsville, I spoke in their church house in that place, on the same subject. After I was done speaking, Bro. Smithwick (a Baptist preacher of the place and clerk of the Monroe county court) arose, and after he had endorsed what I had said, remarked, "I am willing to enter into a friendly debate with any man upon the proposition, that the union that is to effect the salvation of the world, must be upon the Bible alone." He then gave me his right hand, and thus, it is known, he stands with us.

In hope of union and peace in the Lord, A. Sallee.

Eramosa, C. W., March 17th, 1865.

Bro. Pendleton:— * * * Bro. Lard has a large field, and has been kept very busy since he came to Canada. Our severe winter and the exposure after night meetings gave him a bad cold, from which he was recovering when I last heard from him. The churches in Oshawa and Bowmanville, with which he labors, are in a more flourishing condition than ever before, and the numbers added to them since he came among them, must be over 100 converts.

We in Eramosa had a very successful meeting, conducted by C. J. Lister, when 35 persons professed their faith in the Savior and were baptized; 7 more were previously baptized, making in all 42 since the beginning of February.

Bro. Edmund Sheppard is just returned from a visit he made by request to Michigan, where he baptized 2, and organized a church of 9 members.

Upon the whole, the truth is making progress among us, although in some places jealousy and useless speculation are doing much harm.

In love to you and all that love the Lord, James Black.

Clarence, Erie co. N. Y., April 3, 1865.

Bro. Pendleton:—I recently was called to Marilla, to speak a funeral discourse, which I did. Being invited to speak in the evening, I complied, and one volunteer came forward, whom I immersed the next morning. A few days after, I returned, at the request of the brethren, and in six days spoke 10 discourses, three of which were funeral addresses, and immersed two young ladies. J. M. Bartlett.

Indianpolis, Ind, April 8, 1865.

Bro. Pendleton:—I returned home last week from a seven weeks' tour of preaching to the congregations at Bedford, Salem, New Albany, Jeffersonville, Austin, and Crothersville. I had other preachers with me about half the time, and we had about sixty-five additions to the churches, the most of them by faith, repentance and immersion. Four of the Lord's days I gave three discourses per day, and part of the time did the immersing, and one day walked about five miles. My health and voice are good. To the Lord be the praise.

As ever, your brother in the work of the Lord. J. B. New.

Mount Vernon, O. April 1, 1865.

Dear Bro. Pendleton:—I find by reference to our Record of missionary labor, that I have been delinquent in reporting to you, more months than I had intended. Reports from Districts, the past six months (and these are not full), show 732 accessions. The work goes steadily on. R. R. Sloan.

MARVA, Ill. March 22, 1865.

BRO. PENDLETON:— * * I have just closed a protracted effort of two weeks at Clinton, with eleven additions, ten of whom were heads of families. I have been preaching at protracted meetings in this State, with more or less success in all, with very little intermission for the past ten weeks.

Yours fraternally, M. C, TIERS.

SHREVE, Ohio, April 6, 1865.

BRO. PENDLETON:—I closed a meeting of 10 days last week, at Doylestown, in this county, with 55 additions, of whom 43 were immersions.

Your brother in Christ, H. M. PRICE.

PARIS, Ky., April 10, 1865.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:— * * * I have just closed a meeting here with 54 additions by confession and baptism, and 10 by letter. DAVID WALK.

OBITUARIES.

Died, on the 16th of Feb., 1865, at the residence of her husband, in Fleming co., Ky., Mrs. A. Porter, wife of Bro. Roly S. Porter, in the 70th year of her age. She had been a member of the Christian church ever since its first organization in the county in which she lived, and her place was never empty in the congregation of the Lord. She lived for many years a true Christian, in the the full assurance of a happy immortality—and we know that she enjoys the rest that awaits the people of God. P.

Died, in Danbury, Conn. April 5th, 1865, Elder John Abbott, a native of Sitham, England, and for forty-nine years a member of the Christian church in Danbury; a devout man, who "prayed to God always;" a devoted friend of the Bible, and a fearless advocate of the primitive faith; who lived a Christian for 49 years in the midst of sectarian influences; and died in the faith of God, a glorious death. Peace to the ashes of the dear old man.

"Friend after friend departs;
Who hath not lost a friend?" J. A. HEADINGTON.

Died, at his residence in Lawrence co., Ind., on the 10th day of June, 1862, in the 42nd year of his age, Allen Short, son of Elder Ezekiel Short and Jane Short. Bro. Short was baptized into the church in his 20th year, and remained a firm Christian until his death.

Although he removed far fromhis father's house, where he could not without going a great distance commune with the saints, yet often, at his earnest request, I have visited his neighborhood and preached in the groves and school houses near his residence; and when the church was established near him, he was one of its firmest supporters, But I will see him and his sister wife, who crossed the Jordan before him, no more until I meet them around the tree of life.

Also, departed this life, his brother, Seteney Short, on the 26th day of Nov., 1858, in the 26th year of his age, at his residence in Lawrence co., Ind.

Bro. S. Short became a Christian at an early age. He was a young man of

good talents, and wished to devote his life to the proclamation of the Gospel: he was fitting himself for that purpose at the State University, until prevented by sickness. He had the cause of Jesus at heart, and wished to build it up while he lived. Often have we traveled and preached together, and conversed about the church of Jesus which he so ardently loved. But he has gone before us to that glorious land; I shall see him and his Christian wife, who soon followed him to the Paradise of God, no more till I meet them in the Eternal City, where there is no parting. Although these two brethren and their Christian wives have left parents, children, and many other relatives behind sorrowing, yet they do not sorrow without hope.

We thank God that we have the hope of meeting them where there is no sorrow and no parting. WILLIAM BROTHERS.

Springville, Ind., March 1, 1865.

Fell asleep in Jesus, January 25th, 1861, at her home in Lawrence co., Ind., Nancy Short, wife of J. M. Short, in the 34th year of her age. Sister Short obeyed the gospel in her youth, and while she lived, she loved to imitate the Savior in her actions. Truly it might be said of her, she was a Christian in whom was found no guile. She died as she had lived, strong in the faith of the Gospel. She leaves behind a husband, two children, parents, brothers, sisters, and many other relatives, who expect soon to join her in the happy ranks above. WM. BROTHERS.

Died of cancer in the face, in Schuyler co., Mo., April 10th, 1864, Anne White, wife of Peter White, aged 82 years. Her sufferings were in progress about seventeen years, and towards the close, were beyond expression; but she bore them like a Christian indeed. We have known her for some thirty years, and her whole life seemed to be adorned with meekness, gentleness, humility, firmness, quietness, cheerfulness, industry, carefulness, tender-heartedness.—Her Lord's days were chiefly spent in reading the scriptures, or in attending public worship.

She lived in the Presbyterian church for a number of years, but reading the Bible, she found that sprinkling was not baptism, and therefore she was immersed, and lived in the church of Christ till she fell asleep in him.

May we imitate her example, and finally "be caught up together with her to meet the Lord in the air, and so to ever be with the Lord." A. SALLEE.

Died, Dec. 23rd, 1864, Bro. Owen Flannagan, a native of Sligo county, Ireland formerly of Philadelphia, but for many years past a resident of New Orleans. Age, 76 years. Bro. Flannagan was an admirable illustration of the living energy and moral power produced by Christianity. He was indeed a christian man. He had carefully read the Christian Baptist, and its ideas seemed to have penetrated his method of thinking and acting. He seldom conversed on any other subject than Christianity. His intellectual powers were of no common order, and he often spoke for us in our little church here during the past year, never being absent, and always willing to give "a reason for the hope was in him." His consort survives—they had lived together nearly 50 years. W.

New Orleans, Feb. 12, 1865.

THE
MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 36.] BETHANY, W. V., *JUNE*, 1865. [No. VI.

THE TERM "CONFESSION."

Since the time when the simple confession of the name of Jesus Christ was supplanted by cumbrous catechisms, the language of Scripture concerning "the good confession" has been obscured in nearly all translations. Having abandoned the practice, men soon lost sight of the word which represents it. The Latin Vulgate, the original elements of which came into existence while the confession was still preserved in practice, is the only translation I have ever seen which is uniformly faithful to the original in the use of this term. Everywhere that the Greek has *homologeo*, the Latin has *confiteor*, except in Mat. xiv: 7. Here, in the statement that Herod "*promised* with an oath," the Greek term is used in an unusual sense, and the Latin very properly has "*pollicitus est.*"

In the common English version we have the verb rendered "*profess*" three times, and "*giving thanks*" once. The noun, in five out of its six occurrences, is rendered "*profession.*" To this circumstance can be traced a peculiar phraseology of the present day. We call Christians "*professors*;" we say of one who is converted, that he has "made a *profession*," or that he has "*professed* religion;" and we even sometimes speak of "*professing* faith."

To our brethren must be accorded, in history, the credit of at last restering the confession to its original place in the Christian economy, and of bringing back this term to its proper conspicuity. We have not yet, however, fully emancipated ourselves from the above

named sectarian phraseology, nor have our critics and translators yet done full justice to the original term as found in the New Testament.

In this latter direction Bro Anderson has accomplished much by his very excellent translation. He has brought out the fact that Timothy "*confessed the good confession* before many witnesses;" (1 Tim. vi: 12.) has held up Jesus Christ as "the apostle and high priest of our *confession* (Heb. iii: 1.)," and has restored the apostolic exhortation, "Seeing, then, that we have a great high priest, who has passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us *hold fast* our *confession*." (Heb. iv: 14). He has also brought light and order out of darkness and confusion, in Hebrews x. 23. where the common version has it, "Let us hold fast the *profesion of our faith* without wavering, for he is faithful that has promised,"—he gives us instead, "Let us hold fast the unwavering *confession* of our *hope*, for he is faithful who has *promised*." Here the the gross blunder of rendering *elpis*, *faith*, is avoided; the connection which exists between the good confession and the one hope is indicated; and the dependence of *hope* upon the *promise* of him who is faithful, is exhibited.

With these improvements, the student of Anderson's translation will find a much wider range for thought upon the confession, and can arm himself with additional arguments in its defense. But, for complete development of the subject, we need a still closer imitation of the Vulgate's fidelity to the original. In Hebrews xiii. 15. we have, as rendered by Bro. Anderson, the exhortation, "Through him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name." Now the literal rendering of this passage is this: "Through him, therefore, let us continually offer the sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips *confessing* to his name." The "our" before "lips" is not in the original. This rendering shows that the sacrifice of continual praise to God, is the propor fruit of lips that confess to his name. The apostle had asserted above, that "We have a sacrifice, of which those who serve the tabernacle have no right to eat." He here tells what sacrifice that is. This is the primary object of the sentence, and incidentally he alludes to the fact that such praise is the natural fruit which should spring from lips which are sanctified by confession. The confessing intended may be not only the original confession of faith in Jesus, but all subsequent confessions of sin, and all repetitions, before the world, of the original confession; for in all these ways the lips of Christians confess to his name. Here, then, is another important thought connected with the good confession. It is, that lips which have made the confession should ever after speak the praise of God, as a tree brings forth its proper fruit. Tho obligation to do so is as-

sumed by making the confession,—so that it is not a mere idle ceremony, as sectarians declare, but an act which consecrates even the lips that speak it to the praise of God.

In the 9th chapter of 2d Corinthians, there is another passage, in which, though the task is more difficult, the force of the term confession should be eliminated. Speaking of the contribution for the poor saints in Judea, Paul says, "The administration of this service not only supplies the wants of the saints, but also abounds in many thanksgivings to God, since, through the proof which this service gives, they glorify God for *your acknowledged subjection* to the gospel of Christ." The words here rendered "your acknowledged subjection," are *hupotage homologias humoon*, literally "the *subjection of your confession.*" Paul means that the saints of Judea would glorify God for the subjection to the gospel of Christ which followed the confession that the Corinthians had made. It was then, as it is now, that the confession was not always followed by that complete subjection to the gospel which dethrones all selfishness, and makes the brethren prompt to supply each other's wants. That the confession was followed by such subjection in the case of the Corinthians is held up by Paul as a cause for thanksgiving to God; and in thus holding it up he shows that he who makes the confession places himself under obligations to exhibit just such liberality to his poor brethren.—Here is another thought giving honor to the good confession, and which the mere English reader has no access to from any English translation. As I intimated above, it is no easy matter to translate the passage so as to give this thought the perspicuity which it has in the Greek, and which is also given to it in the Latin Vulgate; but no doubt Bro. Anderson will prove equal to the task, if he will undertake it. By using the same freedom in rendering the genitive in this clause, which he has employed in the preceding clause, we might have it thus: "They glorify God for the subjection, which your confession yields, to the gospel of Christ." This is not very bad English, and it gives the sense of the original.

Every one who has ever read Trench's "Study of Words," a work with which every preacher ought to be familiar, is alive to the fact that there is a great deal of *history* in single words. I am sorry that he has not given us a paragraph on the history that is in the word *confession.* The term has a reference to *crime*; and indicates the final acknowledgment of something which had hitherto been kept secret. It throws the memory back, therefore, to the time when it was considered a crime to believe in Jesus. It reaches back to a period in the life of Jesus, when the Pharisees agreed that any who should confess themselves guilty of this crime, should be excluded from the

synagogue, (Jno. ix: 22.) and when many rulers believed on him, but through fear of the Pharisees dared not *confess* it. It brings us along, too, through the dark periods of heathen persecution, in which to *confess* one's self a Christian was to court imprisonment and death. The saints who suffered death in those persecutions, were called by cotemporaneous historians, "*confessors;*" and well would it have been for the world if that name had never been supplanted by the term *professors*, so suggestive of mere pretense. Every man who confesses Jesus Christ is a *confessor*, and if we have a name derived from this source, let us be called confessors. Leave the term *pro*fessor, to quacks who *profess* a knowledge of medicine, to pettifoggers who *profess* a knowledge of the law, and to pedagogues who *profess* to be men of learning: but let the term *con*fession and its cognates, hold a perpetual place in our vocabulary and in our affections, ever reminding us of the first words we spoke when coming as penitent sinners to the footstool of Jesus, and of the bitter persecution that has often followed the confession of faith in Christ. "*Let us hold fast our confession.*"

J. W. McGarvey.

CHRONICLES.

NUNNERIES AND ASYLUMS.

These papers will contain a variety of subjects, and will be handled in a popular form. I propose calling your attention to Nunneries and Asylums, and institutions of a similar character for reasons which will appear in this article. The history of Monastic establishments is too well known for me to enter into any details, and I would not refer to them here, but for important and salutary purposes, affecting the interests of the State and Church. They exist in our country to a limited extent; but they are increasing in number and influence, and are destined to become a mighty power among us as in the Old World. We do not deny the right of any people to form societies and organizations for useful, benevolent and religious purposes. What cannot be done by individual effort may be effected by associated labor. The wisdom and beneficence of the many are greater than that of the few; and an organized body, more potent than the elements of which it is formed. But as man is a social creature, and as his duties and reponsibilities grow out of the social state to an almost unlimited degree, we naturally wish to know why any body of men and women should seek to cut themselves off from their fellow men and live in utter seclusion from Society. An individual may do it for certain reasons known to himself. He may have been disappointed in life; or have

some idiosyncrasy of character which unfits him for society, or be laboring under some hallucination of mind which leads him to the life of a *solitaire*. But we always look upon such persons with feelings of pity, and treat them as persons who have cut themselves off from the common and ordinary walks of life. What then should be our judgment in relation to large classes who do the same? Is it not a subject demanding the careful and thorough examination of the thoughtful minds among us? Such organizations present an *abnormal* condition of things, and as such should be open to our gravest consideration. No one will defend them, for reasons connected with the Apostolic Church. They were utterly unknown in the early history of the Christian Institution. Indeed, their existence seems incompatible with the design of Christianity—which is to be a light in a dark place—a leaven in the midst of society,—the salt, mingling with the masses to keep them from corruption. The disciple is a confessor before men. His life is a public testimony for the truth of the divine mission of Jesus of Nazareth, and a public protest against all forms of irreligion and wickedness. His duties lie in the midst of society, and his influence for good is felt there. His very temptations and trials are designed to call out his noblest traits of character, and call for the most exalted virtues. The world is the plane on which he is to act his part before all eyes upon its surface. He is to be open to the inspection of every one. There are no irregularities, depressions or elevations, in which he may hide, but like the primary planets, he must be seen and read of all men. Such obviously is the case with every disciple of Christ, and of the church of Christ at large. No one is called upon to deny himself the privilege of doing good to others, or to seclude himself from society. The virtues sought to be cultivated in this way are of a doubtful character, and are at best but negative. Innocence is but a poor, passive thing, in the absence of temptation. It has nothing in it, robust and strong or enduring: and until tried, calls for no praise and merits no reward. It is not certain indeed, whether this is secured in the monastic life. As long as human nature is what it is, it cannot be. Men and women will carry their passions and appetites and the instincts of their nature with them in retirement: and although there may not be the same causes for their exercise, or temptations to prompt them, the irregularities indulged in are as sinful as those found outside of the convent, inasmuch as the temptations may be less; and as a well regulated system of casuistry would decide that the stronger the temptation in the world, the greater the apology for crime. In the limited circle of the convent, ambition, pride, selfishness, lust and passion, have the feebler motives to follow and the lesser reasons for their indulgence, and in the eyes of the Great

Lawgiver, may incur the greater amount of guilt. We know what the Savior said of Tyre and Sidon in comparison with Chorazin and Bethsaida; and of Sodom in comparison with Capernaum. The less the temptation, the greater the sin, or in other words, the greater the light and the stronger the evidence in behalf of truth and duty, the greater the sin of neglect and disobedience.

The religion of Christ does not need a narrow, separated class, which has no sympathy in common with the great family of man. No one is called upon to stand alone, or to associate with others, on the top of some Chimborazo, to freeze and to shiver amidst eternal snows, instead of treading the lowly paths of common duty and of life. Men need help, not as crumbs thrown from sumptuous tables to the poor, but as Jesus and the twelve "more than is mete," gave to the hungry multitude, leaving behind large portions to signify the affluence of the Giver.

Jesus was found in the houses and streets of the village and the city; on the sea side and in the desert, scattering the bread of life, profusely and bountifully. His forerunner lived in the desert, on locusts and wild honey, but he was to decrease. His habits and spirit were not in harmony with the wants and necessities of the race. He stood apart, and from the distant point of a sharp angle, sent his arrows into the heart and conscience of an apostate class; but Jesus was the friend of publicans and sinners. He served them and ate with them, and was a man among men. He aimed at nothing higher than to restore the lost image of the races, and to reach the highest type of humanity in the new created and the saved. He linked his fortunes with our fallen world, and as our great Champion, laid down his life, to draw us to God by drawing us to himself.

No one is admitted into his sympathy or partakes of his spirit, who does not follow in his footsteps. Our life must be the consecration of love, as seen in the daily walks of life, dignifying the relations of father, mother, husband and wife, children and neighbors. Whatever is not duty is sin Whatever is not commanded, is will-worship.—Self is to be humbled and Christ exalted. The hand that self-crowns the head of the devotee, is leprous. It has on it the fatal spot of perdition. The thorns of the cloister is a wreath of flame, lit with unholy fire, and in the eyes of God, as despicable as the ivy of Bacchus. The State holds in its territory all men. The church embraces all who confess the Christ and live in obedience to his commands; and the garden enclosed, whose rich fragrance spreads over all, is the family where the selectest influences of both are seen and felt.

But why have I called attention to this subject. I will tell you. Many are fascinated by the spirit of the Papacy. Their temples and

and altars; their music and paintings; their schools and nuns; their cloisters and monasteries, appeal to our taste and imagination, and to the lurking spirit of fanaticism that all men have, and which is most easily evoked by sensuous objects. In this country there is an ample field for the exercise of all the baneful influences of this oppressive and apostate institution. Monasteries, nunneries, cloisters, of every sect and party in the Papacy, are being established in America; and they will rapidly increase in numbers and influence. They should be put on the same level as Asylums for the blind and the deaf; as Homes for the widow and the orphan; and as mad houses for the most unfortunate of our race; and be *subjected by the State to public inspection.* No difference should be made between them in this respect.—All benevolent institutions in this country are open to the most careful inspection by the State; and inquiry is courted and demanded by them. Why should it not be so by monasteries and nunneries? It may be said that they are religious institutions. Granted; but is this any reason why they should be isolated and free from inspection?—Is human nature so perfect as to be free from selfishness, avarice, injustice and oppression, when banded together in convents, and hid from the eye of society? Have monastic institutions been immaculate in Europe and Catholic countries? Have there been no abuses of human rights and privileges; no restraints imposed; no injustice practiced; no man or woman robbed of their humanity and birth rights in these institutions? We are but poorly read if we think so. What enormous wealth has poured into these establishments in Italy, in France, in England, and in Mexico; and what awful wrongs have been inflicted upon society in these cells and prisons and dungeons! We know that many have been put into mad houses from selfish considerations, and by the hand of oppression. Have none been put into monasteries for similar reasons? Many have gone into them and were cured. Are they not liberated at once and restored to their family and society? Surely similar cases occur in the monasteries.—Thousands are sent there by their friends—by the priests—or enter them in an evil hour or under strong temptations, but see their folly, and when too late, repent, but find their cases without remedy. Have not society some interest in such persons? Has not the family? Has not the individual some rights which the State should defend and hold sacred? These are questions of a grave character. We do not ask for any interference with the rights of conscience—no unholy tampering of the State with the freedom of the soul. But we ask that the same inspection—open, free, unreserved, by night and by day—which the State demands over all other public institutions of the land, should obtain with reference to monastic institutions. If they are

free from evil, they will court it. If they are good institutions, they will be known as such, and more generally patronized. The police does not hesitate to visit a church, and even to arrest the preacher in the pulpit, if suspected of crime; and the family is not too sacred to bar from its precincts the officers of justice, and the most rigid search into hidden wrong; and why should the monastery? J. C.

THE CREED QUESTION.

We have always thought, and are more than ever convinced, that the ground occupied by the Disciples on the Creed question, is peculiar. The advocates of human creeds have sought to place us in the same category with Unitarians, Universalists, and various other heterodox Societies. They have argued, with some degree of plausibility, that the mischievous errors and semi-infidel vagaries which some of the creedless parties have advocated, are legitimate offshoots of the no-creed doctrine; and that there is no safeguard against the wildest latitudinarianism, except in a distinct avowal of the fundamental teachings of the Scriptures, in the form of a creed. We, however, object to a classification which assigns us a place with these creedless specimens of heterodoxy; and also to the conclusion in favor of human creeds, attempted to be drawn from the errors and extravagances of the parties referred to. We occupy a ground as distinct and as distant from that of the no-creed advocates, as it is from that of the advocates of human creeds. We admit, with the latter, the absolute necessity of a creed, both for a positive affirmation of essential truth, and for a safeguard against false and pernicious doctrines. We affirm, with the former, the unauthorized and tyrannical dogmatism of human creeds, and their schismatical tendencies. But we deny, what the latter asserts,—the necessity of a *human* creed; and we affirm what the former denies,—the necessity for a *divine* creed. We call attention to this peculiar position, as the only safe resort from the extremes and mischiefs alike of the orthodox and heterodox parties.

The creed parties present certain dogmatic assertions of faith and practice, *as tests of orthodoxy and terms of fellowship.*

Against this we earnestly and vehemently protest, for various reasons, the weight and significance of which are now felt and appreciated much more extensively, in Protestant communities, than in former times. We present, without argument, some of these objections:

1. It is an unauthorized and imperious assumption of a divine prerogative. The Lord Jesus alone is sovereign of the soul; and none other has either the ability or the right to bind the conscience of a

man, or exercise sovereignty over a nature which God alone understands, and to which, therefore, none but God can do justice.

It will not do to argue against this, that every party is under obligation to show its true colors, and inform the public of its distinctive positions. This does not touch the question in dispute. The right of a religious body to inform the public of its peculiarities, simply to meet the demand for information, may be freely conceded, without impairing in the least the force of this protest against human creeds *as terms of religious fellowship*. The former is simply the exercise of a right and a privilege growing out of the relations which a religious community sustains to the public; but the latter is the exercise of fearful power, *unauthorized by any relation existing between the party which asserts it and the party on whom it it is exercised.*—"One is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren."*

II. As a corrollary of the preceding proposition, this human sovereignty over the conscience *practically dethrones the Lord Jesus.* Every human creed in existence insists on terms of fellowship, both in faith and practice, which Jesus Christ never authorized. The least ojectionable among them all, is that which is fasely called the Apostles' creed. Yet even this imposes, as matter of faith, that which the Lord never enjoined. It is perfectly patent, on the face of the New Testament, that but one article of faith was propounded to the applicants for membership in the church of Christ—namely, That Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. It is quite as evident that only for a denial of Christ and his precepts, as taught by the apostles, were any to be excluded from the fellowship of Christians.† But all human creeds insist on other articles of faith in order to admission to church membership, and on other terms of fellowship. Human doctrines, or divine teachings wrought into human forms, or distilled through theological or philosophical alembics, have to be accepted as of divine authority, before church membership can be gained; and various human arrangements and enactments, have to be submitted to as implicitly as if they were divine, in order to acceptable standing in the church. It is a fearful thing thus to attempt to wrest the scepter from the "One Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy." If Moses was shut out from the land of promise, because he failed to magnify the Lord in the eyes of the people, it well becomes those who thus exalt the human against the divine, to consider what doom will be assigned to them by a God whose name is Jealous, and who has declared that he will not give his glory to another. If Saul's family was banished from the throne of Israel, and his own closing years dark-

* Matt. xxiii. 8. † 1 John iv. 1-6.

ened with the frown of heaven, because of his subtle insinuation of human wish and will into divine arrangement; we may well inquire after the fate of such as neutralize the force and sacredness of divine ordinances and laws, by the "commandments and traditions of men."

III. Much that is embodied in human creeds, and insisted on as authoritative, is a contraband imputation from Judaism and heathenism:—the very things that were forsworn by the early Christians.—We do not not pause to speak of the injection into Roman Catholicism, and thence into some forms of Protestantism, of Pagan rites and ceremonies. But it is more important to observe that much of what passes for Protestant theology, is but an imputation of pagan philosophy. The church has been torn for ages with subtle disputations infused from pagan philosophers, which have their proper abode in schools of metaphysics and not in the school of faith. It is difficult to conceive of greater disloyalty to Christ than is found in this substitution of subtleties borrowed from Christless philosophers for the "truth as it is in Jesus."

IV. It embargoes the mind in its investigations, and robs the soul of its blessed heritage of freedom. There is nothing degrading in the utter submission of the soul to the authority of Christ Jesus, for his righteous and all-wise government sacredly guards every legitimate right of the spirit which he has redeemed. His truth makes us free. But there *is* degradation in bowing heart and conscience before any human power, to accept the dictation of Pope, Council, or creed, as a standard of truth and right. It is a servility for which human nature was not created;—a bondage into which it cannot go without the loss of its highest dignity—without bartering away its glorious birthright of self-sovereignty for some poor mess of ecclesiastical pottage. If Esau was profane for selling *his* birthright, who can describe the profanation wrought in the soul that parts with its God-given right to know the truth and judge for itself—especially when the sacrifice is made at the shrine of some petty ecclesiasticism which was engenered amidst the strifes of evil and corrupt times! The free spirit of this age might well say to the most pompous and arrogant of these systems, with a force and point which did not belong to the sentence in its original use—"Thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us?"

V. Human creeds are necessarily schismatical in tendency. Men readily learn that they rest on nothing higher than human authority. When an honest soul feels itself wooed and won by some delightful truth which the creed denies or fails to acknowledge, it will not repudiate the object of its love because the party forbids the bans. For-

bidden to own and embrace truth which comes to it with all the radiance and sweetness of its native heaven, that soul must prove false to its holiest convictions, or go out from its old associations and initiate a new movement. Extremes beget extremes. Anathemas give rise to anathemas. Detraction and persecution produce their legitimate offspring. The honest worshiper of Truth is forced into a partizan advocacy of that which he would have been content to cherish in his own heart as a peculiar treasure;—and to magnify into a sectarian battle-cry that which he would rather have peaceably enjoyed as the right of his own rational nature. This is especially true in the present age. Men will not be compelled to swear by the theological formulæ of a past age. You cannot make thinking men believe that a system growing out of the amorous intrigues of King Henry VIII. of England; or growing up out of the troubled seas in England's civil wars and maddening political strifes; or having its birth amidst the contentions of Burghers and Anti-burghers in Scotland, is to be blindly accepted in this age, as of divine authority. Give them the "law and the testimony" of Christ, and there is an end of controversy. But you cannot, in an age when all the world is laughing over the Pope's last Encyclical letter, and mocking at the harmless thunders of the Vatican, expect that the dwarfish popes of Protestant Christendom are to exact homage and reverence from an enlightened and free people. When the might and terror of ecclesiastical Brobdingnagians, are no longer startling, it is too much to expect to hold the world awe-stricken before the diminutive authorities of Protestant Lilliput. Yet that homage *must* be rendered, or the minds that have outgrown the creeds of former times must be driven out from their former associations, to organize new parties, or to be lost in the mists and fogs of skepticism.

VI. This leads us to say, finally, that these creeds have engendered such a party spirit, and have fostered so many party interests, that so long as their sway is acknowledged, and their authority respected, there can be no union of religious forces for the regeneration of the world. Read the following statement, clipped from a recent daily paper:

"Alarmed at the late developments of the grasping spirit of Roman Catholicism, in the city of New York, a meeting of clergymen of different denominations was called, with a view to consider some possible plan of uniting the evangelical churches, so as to resist successfully the alarming encroachment of Popery.

"A letter was read from an eminent congregational minister (Dr. Bacon) who was not able to be present, setting forth that the easiest way to union was for all to become Congregationalists. Rev.———

of the Presbyterian church stated that their church occupied the middle ground between the extremes of Congregational independency and Episcopacy. He stated distinctly that it was folly to talk about Christian union while the Baptists excluded Christians from their communion table because they were not immersed, and Episcopalians excluded ministers from their pulpits who were ordained by a Presbytery. Dr. Western spoke for the Baptists; he said the basis of Christian union was: 'One Lord, one faith one baptism.' One Lord and one faith they already had. Now let us all have the one baptism —in other words become Baptists—and the union would be complete. He said it was no part of the duty of Baptists to sacrifice their views on that question. Bishop Cox represented the Episcopalians. The feebleness of the Protestant church consisted in its being in *squads*, and not an army. The only basis of union was the church organization known as the Episcopalians. As the Congregationalists insisted on their notions as the basis of Christian union—as Dr. Vermilye said that if to be one all must stand on the Baptist or Episcopal platform 'it never would be done'—as the Baptists refused to yield immersion, and the Episcopalians ordination by a bishop—the impossibility of a further union than now exists was demonstrated—and the convention adjourned."

There is no profound reverence for the Word of God: no taking the shoes from their feet, under the consciousness that they were standing on holy ground, to hear the voice of the divine majesty: no readiness to throw overboard all that had been gain to them, that it might be counted loss for Christ. But a proud and stubborn preference, on every hand, of the claims of party; and a willingness to sacrifice, at the shrine of party, all the best interests of their common Protestantism—thus allowing a united Papacy triumphantly to flaunt in their faces the mummeries of the dark ages, and take up an unimpeded march, under the dismal banners of despotism, through their scattered and broken lines. The truth of God is thus betrayed in the house of its professed friends, by this Judas of party pride—for what? For Congregationalism! for Presbyterianism! for the wretched figment of Apostolic succession! for isms and interests unknown to the Word of God; sacred only in human creeds—embalmed only in human traditions! We ask our readers to ponder well this significant fact.

But, forcible as these reasons seem to be, creed-advocates point triumphantly to Unitarians and other extremists, as evidence of the impracticability of the anti-creed doctrine,—just as the Pope points to the various Neologisms, Rationalisms, and Pantheisms, as offshoots of Protestant freedom,—and seek to soothe an inquiring world back

into silence by these "gorgons and chimeras dire," which threaten their destruction if they are so foolhardy as to break away from the security which their old path gives them.

We tell them, however, that so far as our plea is concerned, we are not to be silenced in this way. We have no more to do with these vagaries than they have; nor so much. For these extremes have been largely occasioned by the intolerance and unreasonableness of orthodox philosophico-ecclesiastical creeds; while we have no responsibility whatever for their existence. "What!" it is said, "do you not stand on the same no creed ground on which they stand? Are you not partners with them in a no-creed advocacy—whose spurious brood you disown, without repudiating the parentage?" We answer decidedly, *No.* Our ground is as distinct from theirs as from yours. We can very readily set this forth in the light of recent developments among the Unitarians. That body—if body they can be called—have recently organized a National Conference of Unitarian churches.—Before this organization was effected, the Unitarian papers had some spicy discussions over the *terms of fellowship* in the proposed Society; some, under the lead of Dr. Bellows, arguing for a well-defined statement of Unitarian faith; others, advocating the widest possible liberalism. The objection to Dr. Bellows' proposition was not based on the fact that the Bible was a sufficient creed, but upon the consideration that the no-creed position of the Unitarians was entirely negative, and did not allow of any positive affirmation of faith. Thus one writer in the Christian Inquirer says: "All who know anything of the internal history of our body, know perfectly well that no unanimous answer to the question (Whence do you get your doctrines?) is possible." One party will refer (if the question of a creed is agitated) to a superhuman Bible and a superhuman Christ; another to the intuitions and reason of the individual soul; while a third oscillates like a pendulum between these two extremes." Another writer in the same paper, says: "Our only peculiar tenet, in which we are all agreed, is really—to disagree, if we see cause."

If any reader should be charitably disposed to regard these as merely isolated cases of individual extravagance, he will be compelled to think differently when he comes to read the proceedings of the National Conference. The opening sermon was preached by Dr. James Freeman Clarke, an editor, and a leading Unitarian divine. In his sermon he expressed the hope that the Convention would gather together and embrace all who regarded themselves as sincere seekers after truth, *all who followed out to their results the intuitions of their own nature*, whether Unitarians or Universalists, Spiritualists, Naturalists, or whatever they might be. He was willing also, *on the same*

ground, to embrace Catholics and orthodox Protestants, if they would adopt the principles of free inquiry. In the whole discourse there was no recognition of the Holy Scriptures as of any authority whatever.

A paper, affirming the Bible to be a revelation from God, acknowledging the Lordship of Jesus, and expressing belief in the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection from the dead, and life everlasting, was instantly tabled. It was managed, however, to introduce the phrase "Lord Jesus Christ" into the preamble of the Constitution, whereupon, "Rev. Mr. Watson, of Cincinnati took the platform, and said, for one, he could not call Jesus Christ "*Lord*." He could not accept the word Lord in the sense in which other Christians accepted it.—They had put aside temporal lordship in America long since; let them also do so in religion. Jesus Christ came to benefit the race; but place him over the head of any man, and he would object to it.—Christ did not come to be a Lord over them; he came to emancipate mankind; and he (the speaker) did not want any one to be thrust between himself and God. He would never be domineered over by any one. He also objected to the use of the phrase, '*Son of God*,' as applied to Christ, if by it they meant that he was a son in any different sense from that in which we are all sons of God.

"Charles C. Burleigh, who appeared as minister of a Unitarian church in Florence, Mass., then took the platform, and not only endorsed what Mr. Watson had said, but insisted that those who called Christ Lord, did not know the meaning of the Scriptures. The word Lord, in the language of the Bible, did not mean Lord; it did not mean even Master; it only meant Mister, and all the Apostles meant to call Jesus Christ, was simply Mr. Jesus Christ. He was proceeding in this strain, when he was called to order for speaking on the preamble, and was obliged to desist."

We have hesitated long as to the propriety of defiling the pages of the Harbinger with sentiments so monstrous from the lips of professed Christian ministers; but have concluded that it is right that our readers should know of the unblushing utterances, in a large representative body, of sentiments which seemed to startle no one, and scarce provoked a word either of rebuke or reply. While such sentiments were tolerated, and even seemed to have the ascendency, every effort to obtain an affirmation of faith in the Scriptures as authoritative, or in the Lord Jesus, as Mediator or Sovereign, was promptly voted down.

Here is the case clearly made out. They repudiate all authority—human and divine—in religion. *They make a creed of no-creedism*; and that is their only creed—as poor and barren a negation as can well

be conceived. *We affirm the Bible as our creed, positively and in good faith.* No man can come among us who does not accept it; no man can stay among us who does not abide by it. The rationalists, semi-infidels, and so-called Liberals of the present time, can have no place with us, because *we have* a creed to which they will not subscribe.—We insist on the most entire submission to the authority of the Lord Jesus, as asserted in the Scriptures of truth. Unless this is accepted, our creed prohibits their entrance among us; or if, by any misunderstanding, they come in, it forbids their stay among us. We do not purpose a union of all who profess to be religious; but only a union of such as are willing to accept the one standard of truth—the Word of God.

But, we are asked, Will that keep out Unitarians or Universalists? We answer, it would soon put an end to all these heresies. It was a departure from this rule, that gave rise to these unhappy sects; a return to it, in letter and spirit, would soon put an end to them. If Trinitarians, Unitarians, and the rest, were to undertake to raise a controversy on these long-mooted questions, we would simply insist on their adhering to plain Scripture teachings, and enjoin on them to "hold fast the form of sound words" which the Scriptures furnish. Among sincere lovers of truth, this would soon end all controversy. If any insisted on unscriptural terms of brotherhood, and refused to be satisfied with the plain affirmations of the Scriptures, they should, after the first and second admonitions, be rejected, *as rebellious against the Word of God.*

Let it be distinctly understood, therefore, that while we heartily repudiate all human creeds, and have a controversy with creed-advocates which we do not mean to slacken, we are equi-distant from the creedless negations of the times. *They* have among their followers no bond of union. There is no cohesion among them, more than among the sands of the desert. We are united in a positive faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and accept as a divinely authoritative creed, the Scriptures given by inspiration.

Let us see to it that our union is based on a real acceptance of the Word of God, and not on a mere affirmation of it as our rule of faith and practice. I. E.

"He that desires to make any progress in the service of God, must begin every day with fresh ardor; he must, as much as possible, keep himself in the presence of God, and in all his actions have no other object in view but that of promoting the divine honor."

CHURCH ORGANIZATION.*

The absence of any thing like a connected and perfect system of church organization, formally and topically set forth in the New Testament, we believe, has been as generally acknowledged as felt. The apostolic style on this subject is more allusory than didactic: they speak of things as already existing and understood, rather than as to be created and ordained by themselves; and are more particular in prescribing the qualifications of officers than in determining the sphere either of their duty or authority. They speak of "the church," "the elders," "the deacons," &c., without stopping to explain to us the meaning of these terms, and introduce to us a narrative of combined action on the part of the converts to Christianity, efficient and orderly, without the least note or comment upon the origin or adoption of any "Book of Discipline" or "Church Liturgy" whatever. When we study the history of any system, either of politics or religion, we find it necessary, in order to understand its structure, to look at its constitution. Presbyterianism nor Methodism, for instance, can be understood from the New Testament nor Old, nor yet from the history of any institution antecedent to, and coeval with, the origin of the Christian church. We must look to their Confession of Faith and Book of Discipline to understand their terms, comprehend their system, or discover the functionaries and functions of their organization. Paul himself would not be able, unless the Holy Spirit should condescend to instruct him, to conduct a process legally, through a modern ecclesiastic court, till he had first taken lessons in the newly invented pleadings; nor to distinguish rightly between a "Synod" and a "General Assembly," a "Class-Leader" and a "Circuit-Rider," till he had first sat at the feet of the Westminster Divines, or been drilled in the *method* of the Father of Methodism. These systems are very orderly, however, and are not only capable of being easily understood, but are actually in operation widely throughout Christendom, working with great efficiency and harmony in the various parts. No person will pretend to say, however, that this state of things ever could have been induced by employing the New Testament alone; in

* Seventeen or eighteen years ago, we wrote and published in the Harbinger a series of articles on "Discipline," which we have been frequently urged to re-publish. Just at this time, an esteemed brother urges us to give the above and a succeeding number to our present readers. Seventeen years brings us to almost a new generation, and probably we shall not find many whose memory will have retained those long published thoughts so perfectly as to destroy the interest of a re-perusal, and we therefore venture to reproduce them.

W. K. P.

short, if there had not been some guide-book or system of ecclesiastic tactics, methodized and detailed in *propria forma*, by and according to which, the party might be modeled and moulded into unity and strength.

Now it must be admitted that the primitive churches possessed a perfect system of organization, distinguished by its exact similarity in every congregation—the same offices, the same duties, the same laws, the same order, and the same objects. Nor can it be denied with any show of either reason or history—that all these, though many, were really *one*, jointly the *body of Christ*—having but *one foundation* and *one head*. Eph. i. 22; 1 Cor. iii. 11; and xii. 12, 13.—Wonderful in wisdom and power is the church of God! Ramifying in its various congregations into myriads of streams, and purifying and refreshing every region of the earth, yet drawing always from the same great ocean and flowing ever back to the fountain whence it springs; infinitely divided, yet nowhere separated; multiplied without number, yet always *one!* 'Tis the great spiritual circulation of the universe—every where present, but always for the same great purpose; working independently, and yet always *co-operating*; pursuing its ends in some cases differently, yet always with a *unity* that marks it as the same!

The question naturally arises, How could this have been? How could the different congregations, so remote from each other and in an age when the facilities for diffusing information were so few, so uniformly and at once adopt the same order and submit to the same discipline? Had the Apostles all assembled immediately after the day of Pentecost, and in general assembly, like the good old Divines at Westminster, composed a creed and ordained a church order, there might have been nothing singular in the case; but we have no mention of any such proceeding, either in the writings of Evangelists and Apostles, or of inspired historians. The unsatisfactory nature of the scriptural directions on this subject, has led some students of the New Testament to conclude that Bishops and Deacons were only appointed in the early ages of Christianity, because of the then uninstructed state of the church; but now, that the full revelation of God is made known, they are no longer of divine authority. Now, we not only dissent entirely from this view of the subject, but believe there can be found a solution to this difficulty, both convincing and satisfactory; and that, too, without sacrificing one jot or tittle of that great principle of reformation, that the Bible alone is the sufficient rule, both of faith and practice.

There are some things we always take for granted. In speaking to our fellow-creatures upon any subject, we presume that they un-

derstand the language in which we address them; and if we present any terms, either new or employed in a new sense, it is expected that we shall explain them; otherwise our language is unintelligible. Again—when we adopt or fall into any system already in practice and well understood, we do not think it necessary to explain or expound it, unless we should wish to change it. In this case, we are at pains only to particularize those things that are new, either by addition or alteration. It is presumed also, that in interpreting the revelations of God, we will avail ourselves of all those collateral aids, which he has, in his providence, provided us with. In walking supremely by the *sun*, we must not shut our eyes altogether to the light of the *moon* and *stars*. Because we cannot read the holy scriptures as they were penned by the fingers of Inspiration, we must not discard the translations which have come to us through much vexation of uninspired criticism. When Paul descants upon the law, he speaks to those who know the law; and if others would comprehend his discourse, he expects them, of course, to study the law. It is not saying too much to affirm, that unless we understand the terms and allusions of our revelation, we cannot learn the lessons intended to be taught by them. How much confusion has been introduced into the professed Christian denominations by the neglect to translate the word *baptize!* Before the error had been so widely adopted and so sacredly canonized, a good Lexicon would have settled the whole matter; but now scarcely any authority is sufficient to shake off this mighty incubus of tradition, which weighs so heavily upon the consciences of men. Still we are compelled to look for the meaning of this word, both in the Lexicons and in the allusions made to it, before we can know what we must do when we are bidden to be *baptized*. So with *faith* and *repentance:* these were prescribed as duties long before Paul defined them; and must, therefore, have been terms generally understood; and unless we can find the modern distinctions of faith among the prevalent uses of this term when it was first preached as a duty, or in special definitions by the apostles, they are not worth a button in apostolic theology.

Let us apply these principles a little farther. Elder, or Presbyter and Bishop, (presbuteros and episcopos,) are terms of frequent occurence in the scriptures; and so with the term Deacon, (diakonos.) Like other words they have a common or radical and literal meaning. This may be ascertained, and must be ascertained, by the same method as we employ in determining the signification of any other word. But besides the common meaning, these terms have a technical import, and are used evidently to indicate an officer or officers. In this use they have a more comprehensive meaning than when employed liter-

ally; and it becomes an important object rightly to determine what this is. How shall this be done? Evidently by the scriptures, if possible; but if they do not explain, then by the usual sources to which we appeal in similar cases. When we read of the Roman *Consuls, Tribunes*, or *Decemviri*, a Latin scholar can tell us that "Consul" means *one to consult with*; that "Tribune" signifies one placed over a tribe; and "Decemviri," simply ten men. But what idea would this give us of these official ranks in the administration of the Roman government? Clearly but a very imperfect and unsatisfactory one. So with the Greek terms *Presbuteros*, *Episcopos*, and *Diakonos*. A Greek scholar could tell us at once that "presbuteros" is an adjective the comparative of *presbus*, and signifies more ancient or venerable—elder, senior, &c.; that "Episcopos" is one who oversees and protects—a president or a guardian; and that "Diakonos" is a servant or minister—one who attends on or acts for another. Yet with all this literal definition, what right conception can we form of these officers in the Christian church? Surely only a very unsatisfactory one.

Whither shall we turn for fuller information in both these cases?—In the first, we would at once seek in Roman history for the *origin* of the officers alluded to, the constitution by which they were created, and their duties defined, or some statement from it; and if this could not be found, we would then inquire into their actions, and by a careful induction of all they did, form a schedule of the duties properly connected with their official station. The President of the United States is an officer created by the constitution and elected by the people. In the Constitution his duties are defined; but if this and all account of it were lost, a diligent inquiry into his actions as President, lawfully performed, would enable us to specify and collate his duties. Would not a similar course be not only proper, but necessary, in regard to the second class of words we have introduced, and which we are more particularly considering? To this, all must answer, Yes. Without further reasoning, then, let us commence the task.

That we may proceed the more orderly, let us discover all that the New Testament teaches us concerning the origin, relations, and duties of these officers; and if this prove unsatisfactory, then examine into whatever other sources of information Providence may have delivered to us.

In the writings of the Evangelists we have, of course, no allusion to either *elder* or *deacon* as an officer of the Christian church, since it had not then been established, and, unless by way of anticipation, could not have had its officers designated; still the word *elder* fre-

quently occurs as an official title, used evidently to signify some officer among the Jews; but how he was appointed, what the exact nature of his duties, and extent of his authority, are questions to which these books do not furnish us with any satisfactory answer. That they were of great influence with the people is evident, and that they had besides, certain official power, is equally clear. By their traditions they swayed the minds, and by their authority ruled the actions of the people. But frequently as they appear in the great drama of redemption, and important as is the part they play in the development of the plot, even to the consummation in the resurrection of the Savior, we cannot gather from it all any perfect and complete description of their official relations and duties as officers in the Jewish polity.

As regards the terms Bishop and Deacon, they do not appear ever to have been used previous to the day of Pentecost, by any writer in the New Testament, in an official sense. The term we translate *Deacon*, is indeed of frequent occurrence in its common signification of minister, and, in New Testament usage, refers as well to the Apostles as to ministers in the common affairs of life. Our Savior, when teaching humility says, Whoever will be great among you, let him be your *diakonos*, (minister). Paul to the Romans calls the civil magistrate *diakonus Theou*, (the minister of God.) Ep. iii. 7. he speaks of himself as a *minister* of the gospel to the Gentiles; and even our Savior is called "a *minister* of circumcision," &c. In these places, however, there is reference only to the performance of some specific service, without any idea of a stated office.

In the 2nd chapter of Acts, 20th verse, the place of Judas is, indeed, called *episcopee*, (bishopric;) but this appears to have had no reference to the office afterwards regularly designated by this term. We come, then, to the allusions made to these officers after the establishment of the kingdom of Christ on the day of Pentecost, and especially to those passages which appear to speak of them as the constituted functionaries in the polity of the church. As in the writings of the Evangelists, so in Acts of Apostles, the term Elder is frequently introduced to indicate a Jewish officer. In Acts iv. 5, 8, it occurs, and elsewhere in this sense. But it is in the 11th chapter and 30th verse that it is employed for the first time as the title of an officer over a Christian church. All that we here find is an incidental allusion to these officers, at Jerusalem; but what we are to understand by *elders* is not declared. We have attempted to show (in a former number, p. 95–6,) that it was in *Jewish* synagogues that the Christian dispensation struggled into life and full development, and that the first allusion which we have to the *appointment* or *constitution* of El-

ders, was in those congregations which Paul and Barnabas had gathered through "the door of faith which God had opened to the *Gentiles*." This we learn from Acts xiv. 23-8. Before this, however, the Christian elders of Jerusalem are spoken of, and in the next chapter the historian represents them as sitting, in connection with the Apostles, upon an appeal made to them by the Gentile churches of Antioch and Syria and Cilicia. The conclnsion in this case seems to have been concurred in by "the Apostles and E ders, with the whole church;" and the letter containing it, which was sent by chief men among the brethren "at Jerusalem, chosen out of their own company," to go with Paul and Barnabas, commenced with the salutation of "Apostles, Elders, and brethren." But this gives us little light as to the office.

The next allusion we have is in the 20th chapter. Here we see Paul sending from Miletus to Ephesus, and calling together the elders of the church; and after invoking them to *witness his faithfulness in declaring unto them all the counsels of God*, he proceeds to charge them in the most solemn and affecting manner as to their duties: "Take *heed*, therefore, unto yourselves and to *all the flock* over which the Holy Spirit hath made you overseers, (*episkopoi*,) or bishops, to *feed* the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departure shall grievous wolves enter among you, not sparing the flock. Also, among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.—Therefore, *watch*." This is an important passage—the farewell charge of the most devoted minister that ever spoke; and from it we learn some of the most prominent duties of elders—viz. *taking heed* both to themselves and the flock; *feeding* the church of God and *watching* against wolves, or heretics and schismatics. It also teaches us that, with Paul, Bishops and Elders were the same; but of this again.

Assuming for the present that Elder and Bishop are but two names for the same officer, we shall regard any allusion to either as applicable to both; and accordingly note the 1st chapter and 1st verse of Philippians as the next passage bearing upon our inquiry. Here Paul names the *bishops* and *deacons* as the persons to whom, together with all the saints, he addres es his letter; but we learn nothing more than that they were distinguished from "all the saints"—that is, held some official rank among them; but what the nature of this is not affirmed. Passing on to 1 Timothy iii. 1, 2, we are told that "if a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work," and then the apostle proceeds to give us the qualifications of this officer: "A bishop, then, must be blameless, the husband of one wife, *vigilant*, sober, of good

behavior, *hospitable*, *apt to teach*; not given to wine, no striker, but gentle, not a brawler nor a lover of money; one that *ruleth* well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity, (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he *take care* of the church of God?) not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Mereover, he must have a good report of them who are without, lest he fall into the reproach and the snare of the devil." Now while this passage is not intended to declare the duties of bishops or elders, from the words in the qualifications we have italicised, we may fairly infer that they were to extend *hospitality willingly to strangers*, especially such strange brethren as might visit them and seek entertainment; that they were to *watch* over the flock entrusted to them, and to *teach* them the things which concerned both their religious duties and privileges; and that they were to *rule over* and *take care* of the church of God in the same spirit of affectionate solicitude and authority with which they governed their own families at home. These duties, we think, are clearly implied in the qualifications prescribed for the officer.

In the fifth chapter of this epistle, 17th verse, it is said, "Let the elders that *rule* well, be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in word and doctrine. For the Scripture saith, thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, the laborer is worthy of his reward. Against an elder receive not an accusation, but by two or three witnesses." Hence, we learn, that it is among the duties of elders to *rule*, and to *labor in word and doctrine*; and that they are to be remunerated for their services; for *honor* can mean nothing less in the connection; but as some would naturally rule better than others, and, from their greater aptness, be more engaged in preaching and teaching, these were to be more liberally compensated. The dignity of this officer, and the respect to be paid to his character, are also taught us in the injunction, not to receive an accusation against an elder, unless corroborated by the testimony of two or three witnesses. Disciples would do well to meditate on these passages, and learn to render more freely and fully both the *honor* [support] and *reverence* due to their elders. The complaints, so common among the churches, about the want of an *efficient eldership* would be silenced, we doubt not, sooner in this way than any other likely to be adopted, and the peace and influence of the body more speedily and effectually secured.

Next to this delineation of a bishop's character stands that, by the same apostle, given in his letter to Titus: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things left unfinished, and to ordain elders in every city as I commanded you. If any one

be without blame, the husband of one wife, having believing children, not accused of riotous living, nor unruly. For a bishop should be blameless, as the steward of God; not self-willed, not prone to anger, not given to wine, not a striker, not one who makes gain by base methods, but hospitable; a lover of good men, prudent, just, holy, temperate; holding fast the true doctrine as he has been taught, that he may be able by wholesome teaching both to exhort and to confute the gainsayers." Tit. i. 5–9. Here the duties of ruling, as in a family, of hospitality, of holding fast the true doctrine, and of exhorting and confuting gainsayers by it, are clearly implied. We select these, out of the other suggestions in these passages, because our search now is not so much after the *qualities* which fitted one for this office, as to find what were the *public duties* connected with it. We would not, by any means, diminish aught from the solemn responsibility under which an elder is placed, to cherish in his heart every virtue and grace prescribed by the Holy Spirit, as the qualifications essential to the successful exercise of his office.

In the epistle of James, the elders are represented as performing a work which was confined to the first age of Christianity—to the days of miracles. "Is any one sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick," &c. Jas. v. 14. The prayer of faith is the prayer of one who has faith to heal diseases, (Acts iii. 16,) and the ceremony of anointing is the same we find alluded to in Mark vi. 13, where it is said: "And they (the twelve) cast out many demons, and anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them." We cannot, therefore, set this down as among the duties of elders now, as do the Mormons.

Peter, in his epistle to the elect sojourners in the dispersion, exhorts the seniors among them: "Feed the flock of God which is with you; exercising the overseer's (bishop's) office, not by constraint, but willingly; neither for the sake of sordid gain, but from good disposition; neither as lording it over the heritage of God, but being patterns to the flock." 1 Pet. v. 1, 2. In this there is, perhaps, nothing suggested which has not already been noted, save perhaps a more definite statement of the motives with which this solemn and responsible office should be entered upon by those who are called to the discharge of its duties.

There yet remains a passage which ought to be noticed in this inquiry, and which suggests a duty not yet named. It is found in 1 Tim. iv. 14, and reads thus: "Neglect not the spiritual gift that is in you, which was given you through prophecy, with the imposition of the hands of the Presbytery or eldership." The imposition of the

hands of the eldership seems to have been for the purpose of setting Timothy apart for the ministry, by the authority and with the consent of the church. Paul and Barnabas, by the command of the Holy Spirit, were thus set apart by the prophets at Antioch; and as in this case there could have been no other virtue in this ceremony than that of a solemn and formal investiture and assumption of office, so we apprehend in the case of Timothy, the imposition of the hands of the eldership could have been for no other purpose; especially when we remember that the spiritual gift which was in him, Paul expressly declares in 2 Tim. i. 6, was conferred upon him by the laying on of his own hands. The ceremony, then, of formally setting apart evangelists, by the imposition of hands, was most clearly in this case performed by the eldership, and we know of no reason why it should not be so now.

There are many allusions to elders in the Apocalypse; but these all have reference to a future state. We believe, then, we have gathered all that the New Testament declares to us concerning the duties of this officer. It would be useful to recapitulate what we have learned; but we must postpone this till another month, when we shall institute a similar examination to determine, as far as possible, the duty of deacons, as well as inquire somewhat more fully into the question, Whether the bishops and elders or presbyters, are the same officers, or two different ranks standing in the relation of superior and subordinate. Till then, to all our readers, favor and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ. W. K. P.

POPULAR INFIDELITY IN LONDON.

In our articles in last year's volume on infidelity, we referred at some length to the wide-spread extent and the character of unbelief in Great Britain. In an article on *Popular Infidelity in the Metropolis*, in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, republished in this country in the May No. of the *Theological Eclectic*, we find the statements we then made on this subject fully confirmed. The moral and religious condition of any part of the world, but especially of the Christian world, is of interest to us; but the moral state of no country, next to our own, concerns us so much as that of Great Britain, because of our very intimate relations with it by language, by affinity, by constant intercourse, and by receiving its teeming literature and thousands of its population into our bosom every year. It is of the first consequence to us to know what the extent, the nature and character, and the causes of the great power of unbelief are, with which we shall have daily more and more to do, and the only true methods of meeting and curing

it. The account the writer referred to gives of the extent and moral character of infidelity among the masses, is truly fearful. He says:

"There is assuredly a necessity for a return to the practice and tactics of earlier times. Infidelity, in the name of science, philosophy, truth-seeking, secularism, free-thinking, or what not, is rampant in our metropolis among the industrial classes, and men, women, and children, are drinking in the poison, in full draughts of obscene blasphemy, or in the more diluted form of simple rationalism. Infidelity, in every degree, openly and unblushingly takes the Christian's day of rest, and the Christian Bible, and uses them for mockery, ribaldry, blasphemy, and all evil."

And again:

"In the upper strata, as we may call them, of doubt and unbelief, there is certainly every appearance of a disposition to conduct controversy on purer and more honorable principles. But in the lower strata of doubt and unbelief, these hopeful signs are by no means always visible; on the contrary, coarse and vulgar invective, carping and false criticism, sensual wit, and political selfishness are lamentably common. The writings and the language of Thomas Paine are still current among the uneducated advocates of skepticism and infidelity. The sheer dishonesty and angry prejudice of the Rev. Robert Taylor still pervert the minds of many, and his *Diegesis* and *Syntagma* furnish the student of bitter incredulity with text-books. Mr. G. J. Holyoke claims to be exceptionally polite among modern living "Secularists;" but his fellow-worker, if not his colleague, Mr. Bradlaugh, *alias* "Iconoclast," rejoices in the crushing weight of his invectives, which he launches against religion. As are the apostles, so are the disciples. Here and there one calmly, quietly, and even courteously, propounds his principles; but there are more who have no such self-control, and who ignorantly and furiously rave against all Christians and against all Christianity, and often against the very being of a God, and what used to be regarded as the elements of natural religion. We have reason to believe that like differences appear in the lives of these men. Some allow of no law of moral conduct beyond that of expediency. Others claim the possession of an inward faculty—whether reason or a moral sense—by means of which they discern right from wrong, and are directed to choose the good and to avoid the evil. Others, again, simply and broadly build on the foundation of gross materialism, and affirm that every man is what he is, and does what he does, as a mere result of organization; hence virtue merits no praise, and vice no blame, except in so far as this, that somehow or other, in early life at least, a man's tendencies resulting from organization may be modified by education. This materialism is extensively prevalent in the metropolis to which our observations apply, and shows itself in the most grotesque and vulgar, nay, monstrous forms. Under its influence, one man becomes a philanthropist, and another an atheist; one and all deny the existence of spirit and of mind as distinct from matter. It is not possible that the low materialist should believe himself endowed with a soul, and destined to immortality. Thus, God and the soul, death, resurrection, judgment, heaven, hell, sin, holiness, nature, and a thousand other

great realities and truths, are either summarily dismissed, or utterly transformed, by some eccentric explanation."

From this statement, and from others made by this and other writers, it is very evident that, after the great universal cause, the working of Satanic influences by the fleshly lusts of our unregenerate nature, one of the chief, perhaps the very chief secondary cause of all this with these people, is a deep-seated *ignorance*, the want of a general illuminating education, that makes them unable to judge and reason correctly, to detect the absurd fallacies offered to them by their leaders and teachers. It makes them the victims of shameful falsehoods and frauds in the hands of cunning and crafty men. Ignorance also produces and feeds vicious, deep-rooted prejudices, which implant bitter enmities in the soul; and this is one of the most difficult things to be overcome in the dark world of ignorance; light alone will triumph over it. But chiefly and above all, it is ignorance of the Bible, of true Christianity, that is at the bottom of all this. This is the testimony of all who are acquainted with the facts in this case. Generally speaking, the Bible, except as it has been presented to them in caricatured, disjointed fragments, with bad intent, is almost totally unknown to these masses. From childhood up they have heard of it, and have been taught to regard it, as "that abominable book," full of all lies, absurdities, and tyrannies; but they are never allowed to know it. The writer says:

"Ignorance of the true teaching of Scripture, and of the nature of language and of evidence, as well as ignorance of many other things that are important, is one of the most prominent reasons for this hostility to the Bible, to Churches, to Christians, to every thing with which the idea of religion is connected.

"Another cause, or a branch of this, is illustrated by Pope's well-known line, "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing." Certain men have got a little knowledge of scientific objections, of critical difficulties, of various readings, of Bishop Colenso and Sir C. Lyell, of Strauss and Renan, of Darwin, and a host of other matters. They have learned quite enough to excite or to confirm their suspicions, but they are utterly without the means of investigating properly the truth of what they suspect. They are able to frame objections, and there is something extraordinary in the facility with which they will throw out a whole string of these objections. It is lamentable to think that while they can do this, and can feel all the force of the objections, they do not know enough frequently to appreciate a reply.

"Blank ignorance and partial knowledge present enormous difficulties, which few can realize who have not attempted their removal. However incredible it may seem, we have known a railing rejector of all religion object to it on the ground of its absurdity. The case adduced by him in proof arose out of our Savior's declaration, in John iii. to Nicodemus: "The parsons tell us," said this unhappy man, "that

we must be born again. I should like to know how that can be. I was born once, and I don't see how I am to be born again," &c.—Not satisfied with this, the same individual denounced the doctrine of a resurrection and a future life, declaring that he did not believe that once dead he should live again, unless it was by becoming the food of loathsome creatures.

"The case just quoted may be deemed an exception. Alas! it could easily be paralleled by examples of equal brutishness. But suppose it represents the lowest level, ought we not to know what that is, though it shows us men who have little that is human except the form? When gross ignorance and impenetrable stupidity are combined, it is all but impossible for any human teaching to prevail, except by very slow and almost imperceptible degrees. When, however, deep-rooted prejudices and immoral principles characterize the ignorant and stupid man, the case is almost hopeless. Yet even this is not uncommon."

The direct remedy for all this evil of ignorance is surely very obvious. The State Church has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. She has no power over the masses. It is just so with every State church; in Protestant countries they are powerless, and are despised; the people are running away from them. In Catholic countries all the power retained is to foster and bless ignorance.—Other men, true missionaries of Christ, untrammelled by the laws and machinery of State churches, must go forth among these people with the Word of God, and in every way, from house to house, bring a true knowledge of the Word of God,—and religiously, of that alone, to the minds and hearts of these many thousands. The attempt, the expectation, to bring these people back into the folds of the State church, of sect establishments with all their human trammels, is vain and hopeless. The true power of God, the living Gospel of the living God, in the hands of *living* servants of Christ, alone affords any hope. This has never been tried; let the trial be effectually made, and good results must inevitably follow.

What a fair field of mischief, of ready and efficient objection, of ridicule and scorn, the abominations of State churches and sectarianism offer to the wicked spirit of unbelief, is thus candidly stated:

"One of the most prevalent objections to religion, seems to be traceable to the errors and inconsistencies of Christians. The divisions of sects and the strife of parties supply an inexhaustible theme. Which *religion* are they to follow—that of the Roman Catholic, of the Greek, of the Churchman, of the Presbyterian, of the Independent, of the Baptist, of the Methodist, etc., etc.? Sometimes the list will take in Budhism, Hindooism, Mohammedanism, and so forth.—The conclusion is, that because all cannot be every way right, none are right. * * * * With reference to the faults of the church, we admit their grievousness, and cannot but wail over them before God and men. It is a horrible thing that avowed members of the church should so live and act as to make the church the laughing-

stock of the infidel. It is a terrible thing that, within the same church, the scornful finger of infidelity can point to Brother Ignatius, to Bishop Colenso, and to the Dean of Ripon, and ask which holds the doctrine of the church, or has the church no doctrine at all? The happy family principle, after all, when pushed to this excess, only excites the scorn and contempt of the mocking blasphemer. Along with these things we hear of pluralities, non-residence, nepotism, simony, fox-hunting parsons, and whatever else is mean or questionable among the clergy. Tithes and church-rates, and all compulsion in religious matters, form an endless fund of ridicule and reproach.—The evil lives, the grasping avarice, the tricks of trade, the political selfishness, the occasional immorality of professed Christians, are hurled as so much mire against Christianity, and declared to be good reasons for rejecting it. Can Christians treat all this with indifference? Let the churches beware lest the blood of souls be upon them."

It is true, as the writer remarks, that much of the denunciation of sects with *these* men, is humbug and pretense. Still, that this sectarianism is an offense and sin against Christ and his truth, a grievous stumbling stone to men, remains forever and incontrovertibly true.—And well were it for Christianity and for humanity, if not one good man would ever again speak a word in its behalf! Yes, in the words of this writer, we warn the defenders of this lasting shame of Christendom, this unhallowed sect-life, and sect-war, to "beware lest the blood of souls be upon them"! And what an awful satire is by this writer presented of the State church, the proud, vaunting State church of England! On the one side, it is decided by the high courts of the realm that a *bishop* that makes war on the inspiration of the Bible, and is hailed by infidels as a rising and shining light, has not forfeited his titles, his prerogatives, his powers and his see. On the other hand, monks of the 'Anglican order of St. Benedict,' in cowl, gown and sandals, officiating in chapels with altars, crucifixes, candles, holy water, images of the Virgin Mary and of St. Benedict,—with processions, banners and incense, and prayers addressed to the Virgin and to the Patron Saint,—are welcomed by the Bishop of Bristol as clergymen of the Church of England!

Finally, this controversy with unbelief is inevitably bringing into the public arena another great question, that the faint-hearted, and the advocates of error, because it is venerable, would fain have kept from the public eye;—and that is the question of pure translations. As the friends of truth have predicted for years, this great demand of truth must be heard; it will not be subdued. It will come forth, however unbidden, into the broad field of controversy among Christians, and between believers and unbelievers. All efforts to stifle this voice are vain, because it is a war against truth and light, against the very majesty of God. Infidelity itself will compel Christians to

heed this demand. This is fully illustrated by the following passage, with which we shall conclude our extracts:

"A very frequent case connected with this point is that dogged perverseness which refuses to put a candid construction upon any thing, and which turns every thing to the account of unbelief. This, also, we shall illustrate by a recent example. It is well known that Dean Alford has written a paper in Dr. Guthrie's *Sunday Magazine*, in which he speaks of the erroneous readings and renderings of the Authorized Version of the Bible. This article fell into the hands of one of our unbelieving acquaintances, and was found to contain an unlimited supply of concessions favorable to infidelity. Next Sunday our objector makes his appearance in the chosen arena for the out-door mission of infidelity. He taxes Christians with hypocrisy and fraud, and declares, on the authority of Dean Alford, that what goes into the hands of women and children as God's Word, is merely a human invention. We had not then read the Dean's article; but, knowing the facts in the case, and knowing, too, that he was too honest and too wise a man to say what was so vague and absurd, we confidently denounced the statement as a gross perversion, and insisted on the production of what Dr. Alford had said. In this we succeeded, and the magazine, crumpled, soiled, and pencil marked, issued at last from a pocket where it had kept company with far different characters. Now, said we, you will please to read what the Dean has said. This he, however, would not do; but eventually allowed it to be read.—The passage was this: 'A formidable list of passages might be given, in which our version either has confessedly misrendered the original, or has followed a form of the text now well known not to have been the original form. These might be corrected at any time, and it is a grievous thing that this has not been done, and is not now doing. For, as matters now stand, we are printing for reading in our churches—we are sending forth, into the cottage and the mansion, books containing passages and phrases which pretend to be the Word of God and are not; and that, when the remedy is easy, and lies at any time in our power.' These words are true, if somewhat unguarded, and we honor him who could be so courageous as to speak them. But we may add, that the propagation of this knowledge will compel the churches, in self-defense, to labor for the production of a better version from a purer text. But to continue our narration. We were asked what honesty there could be in the translators who mixed up with God's Word what was man's word. We replied, they were honest, and gave the best translations in their power; but since the year 1611 several important events have occurred. 1. Some words and phrases have either changed their meaning, or lost it by going out of use. For example, 'to take thought,' in the text, 'Take no thought for the morrow;' again, 'sincere,' in the passage, 'Desire the sincere milk of the word.' Now, 'to take thought' was 'to be anxious,' or 'filled with care,' and 'sincere' meant 'pure' or 'unadulterated.' For these changes the translators cannot be blamed, because the nation itself has made them since. 2. A considerable number of very ancient manuscripts of the Greek New Testament have been discovered, and compared with one another since our version was made; and modern critics, by comparing these, have inferred that the text of our translation is

not so perfect as it might now be made. Here we called attention to some objectionable readings which we had marked in a Greek Testament then in our pocket. We proceeded: 3. Modern scholarship is much in advance of that of the period at which our translators labored. The scientific study of languages has helped us to see more clearly the meaning of particular portions of ancient documents.—The investigation of the topography, the botany, the natural history of Bible countries has, also, enabled us to correct a number of circumstantial errors. There may be still other reasons to account for what Dean Alford so frankly calls attention to, and no honest man of sense can get mischief out of his words."

One great lesson we learn from all this controversy with unbelief; and that is—in the words of our writer—"Return to primitive practice, we say; let Paul and Barnabas go to Mars' Hill, the school of Tyrannus, the market place, and let them speak, and preach, and dispute, as they did centuries ago; they will find Jews and Greeks enough to reason with." So we say!—but be sure that it is the very same pure Gospel they preached! May God speedily send that day! C. L. L.

NEW TRANSLATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

NO. III.

H. T. ANDERSON'S VERSION, CONTINUED.

What we have said in the preceding paragraphs, on the fundamental, general law, that a version of the New Testament must faithfully preserve the character of the original, applies also to *habitual expansions of the text.* This, we think, is a very plain rule. The 'much in a little' is a peculiar characteristic and excellency of the Word of God. Not only is this a peculiarity of the Hebrew, largely the type and fountain of the New Testament style, but it is in a higher sense also a characteristic of the language of God. We insist that general, characteristic *form*, as well as substance, is to be regarded in the Bible. We have a right, and it is profitable to us, to know the difference between the language of God and the language of men. 'Much speaking' is not of God, not pleasing to God. Now this characteristic of the Word of God, ought to be seen by every one that reads it in any language. Every translation that is to be true to the original, must avoid all needless expansions of the original. Besides, such expansions destroy the force and vigor of speech. It may be pleasing to the bad taste of a falsely refined human rhetoric, but such weakening dilutions, reprehensible everywhere, are least of all tolerable in in the Word of God. There are, of course, cases where a translation has necessarily to use more words than are in the original text, to

give a truthful rendering. This every man of reflection must know. Essential differences of languages demand this. In such cases periphrastic forms are allowable; but they should be used with caution, and not be permitted to run into the licentious freedom of habitual expansions, such as we are rebuking. This is a sin, however, that easily besets the translator, especially when he aims at excellency of style, and is anxious to give a very full revelation—perhaps fuller than the original—of the meaning of the text. There is a great proneness to confound *translation* with *exposition*, which is a very reprehensible and dangerous error. For example, in the passage quoted from Dr. Geo. Campbell's version, Matt. 3: 15, we have, '——*ratify every institution.*' This is his *turning* of the passage to express his notion of what was here taught, whatever that can be; but it is not only *not* a translation, but in our judgment, evidently a *per*version of the text. Unreflecting men may regard it as a great merit in a translator that 'he has made the passage very clear' by his enlargements. But let every one consider that translating is one thing, and expounding and explaining is quite another thing; and that what may be thus meritorious in the commentator, is a very serious defect in the translator. Besides, it ought to be clear to every one, that no man must try to make the version clearer and plainer than the original is. There is, moreover, a very great danger in such freedom with the text. The translator in thus *developing* his own views of the passage, runs risk of putting *into* it what is not there, and of thus substituting permanently to thousands the human for the divine, error for truth, in the Word of God. Allow such license, and the result can be clearly foreseen. Because a man believes that this and this is the meaning of the passage, that is no reason why he should so express it in his own extra-scriptural, and un-scriptural, extended words. Express it as nearly as possible as the original has it, with due regard to the laws of your own language, and be satisfied. 'Whatsoever is more than this cometh of evil,' and goes to evil. Afterwards you may expound and explain, and allow the same freedom to others. We may remark here, by the way, on this point, that we have seen a little effort at a kind of pretended-literal translation, issued in numbers, in Illinois, which, while it has no literary merit whatever, is admirably successful in preaching, through its *sub*version, a certain set of not very Biblical views. Every lover of truth has an equal interest in not having the work of translation turned from its legitimate office into that of expounder; and we doubt not that every thoughtful man will agree with us in what we have said on this point.

Dr. George Campbell's translation of the Gospels is one continued

example of the error we have been combating. The most general and most serious objection against the version we are reviewing, is also precisely this same fault. There is a common tendency all through the book in this direction. We were struck by this feature of it in the first specimens we saw of the work; and are confident this will be a very general judgment finally pronounced against it. In some few instances, no doubt, the author is justified in his expansions, and has done no injustice to the text. To most of the cases of this kind —and they are many—we cannot but object. It is not here intended to say, that in all these cases the passages have been expanded to the positive injury of the meaning. By no means. In many it is a simple expansion, but such as we condemn; in some, however, we fear, to the damage of the sense of the Holy Spirit. We give some examples of the many we have noted. Matt. 5: 17, "I have not come *to make them of no effect*, but *to give them their full efficiency*." Here we have *ten* words to translate *two*. This is surely a very free *paraphrase*; and as such it might be accepted, but never as a simple translation. Better far retain the forms 'destroy' or 'abolish,' and 'fulfil.' Matt. 6: 25, "Is not your life a *greater gift* than food?" This is an expository expansion; and we object to the interpolated word 'gift.' Why not retain the simple 'more' or 'greater,' i. e., 'of more value'? Matt. 13: 57, "*And they found in him occasion for offense.*" This sounds like a polite circumlocution, a euphemistic avoiding of the direct, plain, and bold single word of the Greek, 'they were *offended* at him';—for, besides our objection to the circumlocution, the text declares not only that they found *occasion* for offense, but much stronger, that they actually '*were* offended at him.' There is an obvious difference. The Common Version is better; and the Bible Union, in changing 'in' to 'at,' is better still. Dr. George Campbell also uses 'at.'

So much for the historical books. Passing to the Epistles, we select a few passages for illustration of this tendency to expansion.— Rom. 1: 17, "*For in it God's plan of justifying men by faith is revealed in order to faith.*" We only note this important passage here as an example of the author's license with the text. It is one of the strongest instances of expository translation this version affords. It may be observed that the form in this verse is the one by which he generally translates the phrase 'the righteousness of God.' We will not here discuss whether this text has been correctly *expounded* or not—whether 'the righteousness of God from faith to faith' *means* what is expressed in this paraphrase; it is not material to our purpose here. We object to the author's *method* with the text in these passages.— Now—as a brother said to me when I called his attention to this

passage—'this makes it all very plain.' 'Certainly,' we replied; 'but what is plain is Bro. Anderson's view of what the text here teaches; but it is not the simple text itself in English dress; and that is all the translator has a right to put into his work. His *exposition* is not what we want.' Whether even this is rightly given, we leave for future inquiry. The Bible Union version, '*a* righteousness of God,' &c., we cannot but at once reject, as altogether unallowable. Rom. 7: 24, "Who will deliver me from *this body that subjects me to death?*" Here again is a free, paraphrastic exposition of the author's understanding of the apostle's meaning; but a simple translation it surely is not. How much more becoming the Word of God, how much more forcible, weighty, and grand the simple form, 'O wretched man that I am, who will deliver me from the body of this death'!—Whether even the exposition is correct, is a matter of question. We adduce one example more: James 2: 22, 'Do you see that *faith was the moving principle in his works?*' &c. Several objections lie against such a rendering. First, it is the sustitution of a kind of refined, philosophical speech for the very simple forms of the original, 'wrought with'—or if you choose, '*in* his works. Second,—in lieu of a plain translation, it shows how the author would *explain* his view of the passage. This we will not accept in his work. We repeat here, and commend as worthy of all acceptation, the noble words which Bengel is said daily to have uttered, as a great law, to his students even on the subject of the *exposition* of the Bible—'Ne quid *im*ponatis textui'—'Don't *im*pound into the text,' your own views of it.

We have selected only a few of the many passages of this class with which the work abounds. We are convinced that the liberties the author has taken, in this respect, with the original, will bring the verdict of criticism against his work. It is impossible that such treatment of the sacred text should be allowed in a translation. We feel constrained to say this, and we desire to say it with the profoundest respect for the author,—whose deep and pious reverence for the Word of God, and whose learning and skill in the New Testament and in the Greek language, we would not for a moment call in question. We know that these high qualities are his. Yet the Word of God is supreme! *it* must be guarded and reverenced above all The sacred text must remain intact in the integrity of the divine form. We will allow neither a *paraphrase* nor an *abstract* of it, in the name of a translation, in place of the text itself. Such as it is, it must remain. The translator may have made many passages very plain to the reader; but the very liability to have the minds of many people misled, who accept a rendering because *it is* very plain in what it—the rendering—wishes to say, and because it is a very plain setting forth of their and

the author's *views* of a passage and of religious truth; and who by this predilection for the rendering are easily brought to false views of translation, and to accept for the Word of God what is merely somebody's view of it;—this danger alone, we say, must lead us to protest boldly against this freedom in translations. The excellent author, of course, will, in the true spirit of a Christian and scholarly, enlightened liberality, know how to appreciate and accept what we have said. We may here say, that we feel it would be unworthy of him to speak of his work with a fearful reserve, as if he were neither willing nor able to bear free and candid criticism, offered, as we have ours, in a spirit of that kindness and respectfulness that we trust and hope will always characterize what we have to say of those of whom we choose to speak.

A number of passages—some of interest in the simple question of translation, others for what is taught in them, and that come under no special head—we have reserved for a general notice in a separate article. In some of these cases it will be seen that the author has done us no small service in throwing, by a better translation, light upon important passages, hitherto obscured, either by originally defective translation, or by the changes of our tongue through the last two centuries. Before we close this number, we desire to call attention to two other important points in this great question of the translation of the Bible. We do this, because we believe it is the high duty of all to contribute what they can, so to educate and enlighten the public mind, as to enable it correctly to judge a translation of the Word of God, that comes before it claiming attention and acceptance.

First, then,—in the translation the *identity* of the original should not be lost. This is but just to the Bible, even as a mere literary production. This identity looks to all those essential and transferable peculiarities that mark and distinguish the literary individuality and unity of every writer. This unity looks to substance and forms.—It is not necessary, or inevitable, as some might suppose, that this must be lost in a translation. Where strict justice is demanded, it is not allowed to be lost, or else the reader cannot, in any wise and to any degree, see the author as the reader of the original can see him. A translation that would make Job or Æschylus speak like Shakspeare or Massinger; Moses, Herodotus, or Tacitus like Gibbon, Hume, or Bancroft; Homer like Wordsworth; or make an Arabian poet of any age speak like Tennyson;—would not be tolerated for a moment; it would be false to the past, and false to the present;—it would be presenting these writers in a character wholly untrue—would virtually destroy them in the translation. Suppose some one should reproduce

the delightful, early, mythical tales of the ancient or modern nations in the stately periods of Gibbon;—who could recognize them? who could form any idea of their true, primitive forms? But let any one read the mythical and semi-mythical stories of Latium so reproduced by the thoroughly-skilled master-hand of an Arnold, and he will have them in life-like forms before him. This we demand of any one that assumes to stand as a literary mediator between the great past and the great present;—that dares the task—perilous as it is—to cite forth by his magic wand the great forms from their graves in the solemn, hoary Past! Let not the untaught, unskilled hand of the apprentice seize the wizard-master's wand to play with,—to disturb in their rest, the great spirits of antiquity!

But above all do we make this strict demand in a standard translation of the Bible. No books have such great and important and interesting characteristics as those that constitute this volume. Think of the far-off past of Moses! Ere Homer or Hesiod sang, the man of Horeb wrote those immortal books. They ante-date all the known literature of the civilized world. Across the ocean-breadths of millenniums, the spirit of that mighty man of God is to be brought back to us,—not in the courtly phrase of the modern historian, but such as he was when he spoke to 'the thousands of Israel' in his day. We must hear David sing as the *Hebrew* bard, 'the sweet Psalmist of Israel,' and no other. We must hear the solemn wail of the princely Jeremiah, as it resounded over the ruins of Jerusalem, in the spirit and forms of the *Hebrew's* lamentations. We must know John as John, and Paul as Paul, and not have these spiritual forms of God's chosen men lost in modern translations. If we speak of the New Testament only, there is, for example, the universally characteristic Hebrew coloring, arising from the origin and religious education of the writers, as well as from the subjects it embraces. This is revealed in the peculiar use of certain words, in forms of expression;—in fine, constantly manifested in the whole current of thought and speech of the New Testament—in its general imagery,—its figurative language. Now, to annihilate all this, and make Christ and the apostles, and the other characters of the New Testament, talk like men of our day and of our speech, because they speak *in* our speech, would be a very grievous outrage upon the authors, the characters, and the religion of that book,—as well as upon the people of our age. If Jews like Paul, Peter and James, and the characters that appear on the theater in the Evangelists, spoke as Hebrews, we want and ought to hear them so speak. The body of the Bible is not to be so melted down and cast anew in modern moulds, as to lose its distinctive peculiarities, and come out a new thing. We refer not now to mere matters of idiom,

such as every language possesses, which are simple matters of language, and do not demand transmission in translation. No one, of course, would suppose that we meant to say that because the Hebrews use a term equivalent to our word 'lip' where we say 'tongue,' or 'speech,' that therefore we should say, 'the people were of one lip'; or because they repeat the adjective to express the superlative degree, that in translation we should do the same in English. And so of the Greek. But, for example, when a French translation which we have seen, of the *Philippics* of Demosthenes translates the noble address, 'Athenians,' or 'Men of Athens,' by the weak modernism, *Messieurs*, 'Gentlemen,' and DeSacy make the Ephesians cry out, '*Vive* la Diane des Ephesiens,' '*Hurrah* for Diana of the Ephesians,' we beg leave to object. Neither Demosthenes nor the Ephesians said such things; we want in good English to know what they said. We know it is not an easy matter for the translator to fill all the demands of the law of translation we are here discussing, and which is universally recognized;—but it is likewise true that it is not every man that is fitted for the great work of translating the Bible. The man that essays it, is treading a very responsible path,—as the Greeks say, 'on a razor's edge;' and a high preparation of mind and heart, and much patient and diligent labor, alone can give true success to his work. A translation in our day, in our language, that has nobly achieved the high point of perfection we have been here vindicating, is yet a desideratum. The chaplet of this fame can be placed, as yet, upon the brow of no one that has striven for the mastery.

But, finally, while a translation should be faithful in the points above noticed,—the character of the original itself, the reputation of the Christian church for learning, and a respect for the people to whom the Bible is to be given, all demand that it should also be a monument of the purity and the excellency of the language into which it is to be made. For, while the language of the New Testament, for example, is simple and unaffected by the idle pomp and show of human rhetoric; while it is not the Greek of the orators and the philosophers of the golden age of Greece; whatever be its peculiarities in other respects, it is nevertheless excellent as a monument of the Hebrew-Hellenistic style, and, grammatically, strictly in harmony with the laws of the Greek language. An English translation made now, while doing full justice to all the essential characteristics of the Hebrew-Greek writers, should be the perfection of the noble, rich, and vigorous common English tongue of our day, known and cherished alike by all that everywhere speak it, and should stand as such, as an honored monument, to succeeding generations. This, too, is yet a want!

Reader!—the writer of this has not forgotten the brave, just words of Luther, that introduced the second article of this series. To advise, and to do; to order, and to accomplish;—how easy often the one, how arduous the other! With respect, with love and admiration, we look up to the high-souled, generous toiler who, with his steadfast eye on the pure summit of the perfection of mortal work, —though he may not have reached it,—has yet, with the pure ideal in his soul and an ardent prayer for its realization, made a noble advance up the holy mount! To all such we bid,—God speed! C. L. L.

THE NATURE OF CHRISTIAN FAITH.

Three expressions are used in Scripture, by which the moral feelings which Christian faith includes may be clearly ascertained.

To "*believe*," is to take the word of any one, to receive his statements as true; this may be done from the evidence adduced, without any reference to personal character, as we take the affirmation of a child, whose cry declares its pain, or that the habitation is on fire. The fact is received in that case; but the idea that the child is competent to meet the declared emergency never enters the mind. To "*rely upon*," includes more; it is an act by which one person reposes, what he feels to be important, on the character and competency of another. It implies a sense of personal insufficiency on the part of the believer, and a personal all-sufficiency on the part of him who is entrusted with the matter in hand. The former kind of faith is needful in receiving the doctrine which our Lord declares; the second is required in confiding to him, in his action and office, the great work of salvation with which he is entrusted. To "*believe into*," means something more even than this; for a person "*in Christ*," is not only dependent on his aid, but subjected to his authority; and is, actually and willingly, in the power of Christ. The sense of the expression requires the introduction of a verb of motion, as if written, *he believed* (*entering*) *into Christ*, when the action is in the present tense; or, *he believed* (*having entered*) *into Christ*, when the action is in the past tense; and cases occur in which it might be written, *he believed* (*to enter*) *into Christ*, when the person named was in a state of mind, wherein the confidence he had in Christ prepared him to place himself, for time and for eternity, in the hands of the Redeemer, without any reservation. In these three forms of expression, the three-fold aspect of a disciple's faith is placed before us. By a subject of this faith, the word of the Lord is admitted as true; the personal character and attributes of our Lord are admitted to be perfect; and the directions of our Lord are received as legitimate and authoritative.—

These are not three kinds of faith; but three aspects or actions of the same faith—the faith of a Christian disciple. By these features, too, it is distinguished from all merely intellectual states of mind.—The most capacious knowledge of Divine truth may exist, where this moral subjection to the Savior has never been yielded; but however ignorant or sinful a man may be, if this believing subjection to the Savior be attained, professed, and accredited, he shall be saved, and ought to be received as a subject of the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is this which makes him look back on his past life with contrition, to the future with hope, and to show a grateful devotion in present obedience. To the ascertaining of this condition in the heart, therefore, all attention ought to be directed in admitting members to the Christian church. The cant of liberality, and the slang of sectarian strictness, may, by the most of men be acquired with equal facility; but when used to veil the deformities of an unrenewed heart, they can only lead to increased corruption. It is the heart that must form the place of the Redeemer's throne; and before he takes his dwelling there, the heart must be broken. It is the broken, the contrite, the new heart, with all its delicate moral sensibilities and griefs, which forms the seed-bed of Christian virtue. This childlike disposition in the presence of the Savior, which receives his doctrine, reposes on his personal perfections, and submits to his authority in all things, known and unknown for time and for eternity, is the new creation of God; and, of those who are such, he forms his family, his church, his kingdom, that shall remain forever. Let the builders of Zion find and use these living stones, this gold and silver, these precious stones, and, come what will, the work shall never perish; but if through impatience or worldly policy, they build into this holy fabric wood, hay, straw, stubble, or icy conglomerates of polemical dogmas frozen to consistency, smeared with the compost of formal profession, and marked with the watch-word of sectarian interest, the work shall not stand, immersed or unimmersed; it is vanity and the day shall declare it. C. D. H.

OHIO MISSIONARY MEETING.

The Ohio State Missionary Meeting held its *fourteenth* anniversary on the 23rd, 24th and 25th days of May, at Ashland, O. We had the pleasure of meeting with the brethren convened on this occasion, and have rarely enjoyed so large, harmonious and enthusiastic a convocation as it presented. We met with many old friends and renewed the joys of other days. Brethren Parmley, Buckbee, Gilbert and Horner were there from New York and contributed much by their affection-

ate, earnest and eloquent addresses to the pleasure and enthusiasm of the meeting. From Indiana, we greeted brother Goodwin, the industrious and amiable Editor of the Record; Bro. Burgess, the vigilant pastor of the church in Indianapolis, and at the same time, the able and hard working Cor. Sec'y of the A. C. M. Society, and Brother Howe, the devoted and earnest Secr'y of the Indiana State Missionary Board. These brethren all took a lively part in the proceedings of the convention, and added much, by their point and pathos, to the interest of its discussions. Brethren from other States were present, among whom we remember particularly Bro. Haley, of Mo., for his earnest and eloquent words of Christian cheer and greeting; Bro. Smith from Mass., who told us of the hopeful beginning, which they are making in the old Bay State, for the spread of apostolic order and doctrine; and Bro. A. E. Myers of W. Va., well informed in our plea for reformation and true as steel to all that concerns the purity and peace of Zion.

Ohio herself was out in her strength, from Cleveland to Cincinnati—and the borders of Pennsylvania to Indiana—and a happier, finer looking turn out we have seldom greeted at any similar gathering. The speeches were never better, and the harmony and brotherly love never more distinguished. Bro. J. H. Jones, now of East Cleveland, led off with one of his electric displays that threw a charm over the whole body. All were delighted to hail him in his true place—a soldier of the cross, holding up the banner of the Crucified, and pleading for the interests of Zion. Bro. Franklin, of "the Review,' we never locate. Men say now he is from Indiana, but we think of him always as "out holding meetings." His pleasure was to discover to us the secret of success in this art. Strong, earnest practical, and driving always at his purpose, his address will be long and profitably remembered especially by those, who are engaged in the great work of preaching the gospel. Bro. Fillmore, whom we also think of ever as a bird of passage, was there to thrill us with some fine things out of his "Polyphonic." Music is his familiar work and aided by Bro. McMillan and wife, bro. Walker and other voices strong and sweet, he touched us rarely with its peculiar charms. Pity but he could carry his gift into every congregation, and taking the music from the praiseless melodians, give it to glad and joyful human voices to the edification and harmony of the church!

Intervals in business were filled up with exhortations of which we cannot speak too highly. They have the happiest effect upon all, a sort of refreshing that gives new life to the soul and lifts it up nearer to God. The ring of many such is still in our ears, and with them we unconsciously whisper the names of Parmley and Green,—

Dr. E. Parmley of New York, whose feeling is more touching even than his words,—and A. B. Green, of Ravenna, O., whose noble nature and pure Christian life lend an eloquence and pathos to his utterances that art can neither imitate nor aid.

The great items of business were finely introduced by the report of their model Corresponding Secretary, Bro. Sloan of Mt. Vernon. The past was full of results for gratitude, and the future imploring for labor and alluring with hope. The board under the presidency of our potent brother Dr. Robison of Cleveland, had done their work wisely and well, and by the well earned confidence of the meeting were again charged with the interests of the Society for the future. How much depends upon having the right men in the right place can be well learned by any who will make himself acquainted with the secret workings of this missionary effort in Ohio. In all cases, perhaps as in this, it will be found, that to a few determined and generous men, we are indebted, not only for ultimate success, but in the first few years of struggle and trial, for the very life itself of the organization.

As is usual in promiscuous assemblies, where many things have to be discussed, there will be occasional *moves, out of order*, but the surprise with us was, not that there was some, but that there was so little to call for the controlling judgment of our prompt, ever ready and graceful president, Bro. R. M. Bishop of Cincinnati. We are glad that the Society did not excuso him from this service, for whatever politicians may say about rotation in office, in the Christian Church when we get the right man in the right place, let it be, if not for life, at least during good behavior, which, with such a man as bro. B., will, we take it, be about the same thing.

The order of busines was well arranged, by the Committee, with our highly gifted brother Moffett at their head, and everything correctly and concisely reported by the accomplished Secretary, bro A. S. Hayden. We were pleased to see brethren who are not preachers, but business men, take an active part in the proceedings. The practical interests of the church are never so well provided for and managed, as when committed to the wisdom and experience of such men as brethren Lake, Gonld, Hurlburt, Austin, Sampsel, Lape, and a host of others we need not mention.

The subject of Sunday Schools elicited quite an interesting discussion, and while there was some difference of opinion as to the best way of increasing the interest of the church in this work, and of multiplying the number and improving the efficiency of schools, there was none as to their utility and importance. This we hail as a good omen.

A proposition from the A. C. M. Society to convert the State Mis-

sionary Societies into financial auxiliaries, so that twenty-five per cent. of all collections made by the State Societies shall be paid over to the general Society, and seventy-five per cent. of all collections made by the general Society in any State shall be paid over to the auxiliary Society of that State, was discussed with a great deal of interest. The objects of this proposed affiliation are, to cement more strongly the union of the brotherhood in the Lord, to prevent any disagreeable conflict of agencies, to economize the work of raising money, and to excite a more diffused and harmonious interest all over the States, in the work of general missions. The State Boards are to remain as now, to distribute at their single discretion the seventy-five per cent. of the joint fund to be set apart for State purposes, to be *ex officio* members of the general Board, and to render up their report to the general Society, that it may be incorporated with the reports of other States in one common report of the A. C. M. Society, as the total result of missionary work among us as one people. Brethren Dr. Robison, Burgess, Goodwin, Buckbee, Myers, Jones, Walker, Sloan, Gould, and Rowe, the indefatigable and successful State agent for the A. C. M. S., with others, participated in the discussion. It was finally agreed that the matter should lie over, as the scheme proposed required the amendment of the Constitution, which could not be done without a year's notice. This notice was given, and the subject left in the hands of a commmittee, with the favorable commendation of the meeting.

Ministerial Education occupied a large place in the minds of the brethren, and was pointedly brought up for consideration and action by a resolution of Bro. James Atkins, of Akron. Bro. Rhodes had given us a forcible speech on this subject before, and Bro. Atkins enforced his resolution with much strength and earnestness. We had some fine remarks also on this and other subjects, during the meeting, by our promising young brother Hinsdale. Others participated, and there was quite an agreement in feeling, but no readiness for action. The subject was accordingly laid over.

I should not forget to notice the noble hospitality of the good people of the town of Ashland. A resolution of thanks offered in appropriate terms by Bro. Lape, of Cincinnati, was responded to in a way that left no doubt as to the high appreciation we all felt of the generous greeting with which we were met. Brethren Norton, Hickok, and others, took the burthen of disposing of all strangers, and both their discretion and vigilance were without fault. We owe our especial thanks personally for the generous attention paid us by our beloved brother and sister Sampsel. Their commodious dwelling was filled with lodgers, and their still larger table crowded with friends to enjoy,

the good things with which it was so bountifully laden. Evidently the good people of Ashland feel and respect the force of the command to be ready to entertain strangers. Without respect to denominational distinction, persons of all parties and of no party received us with open arms, and we were made to feel at home wherever we went.—We remember particularly the polite hospitality of Mr. Jennings and Mr. Smith, both, we believe, of the Presbyterian church, whose entertainment we had the pleasure of sharing in company with other friends, during a part of our sojourn in their hospitable town. Our meetings were held in the Methodist House of worship, which that body had kindly tendered for the purpose, and thus our comfort and convenience were greatly promoted. Their kindness will not be forgotten. The minister in charge, together with those of other denominations, were frequent attendants at our deliberations. We formed a very agreeable acquaintance with Dr. Myers, and trust that these interviews and interchanges of Christian courtesy may serve in some measure to smooth over unnecessary asperities and soften prejudices that hinder the truth. May the Lord bless all his people, and hasten the day when they shall all be united in the bonds of a true and scriptural fellowship! W. K. P.

EXTRAORDINARY MUNIFICENCE.

From one of the leading journals of our country, we quote the following account of the noble acts of large munificence of Mr. Cornell, of Ithaca, N. Y.:

"The Hon. Ezra Cornell, of Ithaca, N. Y., has, during the past year, founded a public library in that town, of sixty thousand volumes, and erected an elegant edifice of stone for its reception, devoting the rent of that portion of the building not occupied by the library, to the support and increase of the same. The library thus established will be endowed in this manner with an annual income of about $3,000.—The total value of this benefaction is not less than $150,000. The library is to be free forever to all the inhabitants of Ithaca and Tompkins county.

"Mr. Cornell has also given to the State of New York the sum of $500,000, and a farm of 300 acres adjoining the village of Ithaca, for the establishment of an Agricultural College of the highest grade.—This magnificent donation has just been accepted by the Legislature, and the College thus founded will be the recipient of New York's share of the public domain appropriated by Congress for the promotion of agricultural improvement. The value of the 300 acres of land which is to be the site of this College, is estimated at $15,000, making the total amount of Mr. Cornell's donation to the State for agricultural purposes, $515,000.

"Nor does the estimable Cornell rest here in his work of philanthropy. Casting his eyes over the country, he perceives a vast num-

ber of persons to be widowed and orphaned by the civil war, and forthwith resolves to appropriate $400,000 from his coffers to found an Asylum at Ithaca for the widows and orphans of soldiers who have fallen in the present contest. To resolve and to act is with him the same, and his workmen have already laid the foundation of this noble charity.

"Thus in the space of one year has Mr. Cornell given more than a million of dollars for charitable and educational purposes."

The spirit of benevolence is, we notice, producing rich fruits in other directions, from other noble hearts. Rochester Theological Seminary is about completing an endowment of *One Hundred Thousand* Dollars for the theological department. Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y., has received from the munificent bounty of Messrs. Trevor and Colgate, *Sixty Thousand Dollars.* Half of this sum is to be appropriated to the creation of free scholarships to educate soldiers and sailors who have served in the recent war, and ultimately for the education of students for the ministry. The other half is to constitute a Presidential fund. The readers of the Harbinger will recall other similar generous gifts for education, heretofore noticed on our pages.

What are we doing? We point with high satisfaction to the noble example of our brethren in Ky., who under the indefatigable labors of Bro. Bowman, are now adding one hundred thousand dollars more, to the already enormous endowment of Kentucky University, so that that Institution will soon command a total endowment of nearly *three fourths* of *a million of dollars.* What do the friends of Bethany College say for her? Will none of those whom the Lord has so signally blessed in the sudden disposal of his providential favors, come up to her aid and crown her long years of labor and toil in behalf of our cause, with the means of still more enlarged usefulness? Against a thousand difficulties and disadvantages, we can safely claim for her, that she has done more to sustain our cause and fit it for its present commanding influence than all other colleges among us combined. Her sons are an honor to us, wherever they are found, and she is still adding, with all the might that is given to her to the efficiency of the great corps of public laborers, who are now so zealously and triumphantly pushing onthe interests of the reformation. Her Faculty look with anxious hearts for help, to give her greater power in this noblest work left for human hands to do. Surely the Lord will not let his people forget her. We need twenty thousand dollars to complete our building, which with this aid will stand out beyond comparison, the finest College Edifice in the United States—an honor to us and the age. Who will take the honor of erecting her Grand Hall, and of associating his name with it forever? We want the ——— Hall of Bethany College. Who will fill up the blank

space with his name? But besides this we want a ——— Library of Bethany College. Who will fill up this blank with a name to be ever honored among the grateful and admiring sons of Letters? But yet again—How long and loud has been the call for the establishment of a comprehensive and thorough "Biblical Institute of Bethany College," and yet how slow are the liberal aud able men among us to come up generously to supply this want? Who will lay this offering at the feet of the Master's Cause? We know men that can do it —that feel, I doubt not, that they ought to do it. Would that we could persuade them to endow such a department with us, and thus give us the means of crowning our already great work for the filling up of the ministry, with a thorough and complete organization of men and means for making it commensurate with the wide and distressing demand that is coming up to us from all parts of the brotherhood.

We have given the fourth of a century of the prime of our life to toil in this field, (almost against hope sometimes,) under the noble inspiration of a man whose days of public service are now over, but who is still deeply solicitous to see the dream of his life realized in reference to Bethany College; and we cannot see and hear of so much generous benevolence all around us, without putting in a plea that Bethany College, the oldest and hitherto most fruitful of all our nurseries of public men, may not be forgotten. We are persuaded better things, though we thus write. It cannot be that the people of God, foremost in their fidelity to his word and their zeal for spreading the triumphs of the Cross, will, in these times when God seems to be specially stirring the hearts of his servants to provide for free education, remain unmoved by the appeals which the church is so loudly sending up to them for help, and seem as if they were heedless of duty, ungrateful for his signal providences, or callous to the influence of examples whose princely generosity is so suggestive of imitation. Who will give name to our Hall—found our Library—endow our Institute?—and thus link their memory to the long renown of future generations, and their name as a household word to the hearts of the thousands who shall be made glad by their beneficence. W. K. P.

"PREACHERS' ASSOCIATION OF WESTERN PA."

The next meeting of this Association will be held, the Lord willing, at Braddock's Field, commencing at 7½ o'clock P. M., July 11, 1865.

All our preachers residing in this vicinity are cordially invited to be in attendance. Though the Association is, in the name, confined to "Western Pa.," still the brethren in other parts of the State, and in the adjacent districts of Ohio and Va. are not excluded.

Braddock's Field, Pa., May 9, 1865. A. S. Hale, Sec.

MISSIONARY OPERATIONS IN KENTUCKY.

LEXINGTON, KY., May 20, 1865.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—I have thought that it might not be uninteresting to your readers to give you something of our missionary efforts in Kentucky. We are laboring to collect large means for the work, through Bro. Munnell's general agency, and the special efforts of our Evangelists within their circuits; and thus far the prospects are reasonable.

Since October, our Evangelists have received as contributions $1,500, and this sum will be largely increased by the regular quarterly contributions of the churches. We should raise not less than from ten to twenty thousand dollars this year.

The evangelical spirit has somewhat increased, and the churches are showing increased desire to send out the good news. Only 513 additions have been made to the churches visited by our missionaries. This is small progress. Yet we have had the most unfavorable winter and spring for successful labor known to me. The rain, mud, and cold have been intolerable, beside much trouble from rogues and raiders.

Our motto must be, Work, Work, leaving the success with God.

Truly yours, GEO. W. ELLEY.

TRIBUTE TO BRO. GEORGE G. MULLINS.

THE church of Disciples of Christ at Philadelphia, in accepting the resignation of their late pastor, Bro. Geo. G. Mullins, unanimously adopted the following preamble and resolutions:

Whereas, It has become necessary, in the providence of God, for our beloved brother, George G. Mullins, to retire from the arduous duties imposed upon him by his relation to this church, as its minister; and whereas his connection with us has greatly endeared him to us, and caused us to feel deep sorrow that his failing health should make it necessary for him to be separated from us, and feeling that his faithfulness, while with us, calls for some expression of our affectionate regard for him, and appreciation of his labors among us; Therefore

Resolved, That we accept the resignation of Bro. Geo. G. Mullins with unfeigned regret that his failing health should make it necessary for him to retire from the public ministry of the Word, and consequently to sever the relation which has so happily existed between us.

Resolved, That we regard Bro. Mullins as possessing in an eminent degree, many of those qualities, both of mind and heart, which fit the minister of the Gospel for great usefulness in the work of the Lord.

Resolved, That we will hold brother Mullins in affectionate remembrance, and cherish the hope that our Heavenly Father will, in answer to our earnest prayers, restore him to health, and make him the honored instrument of bringing many souls to Christ

Resolved, That we commend our brother to the confidence and Christian affection of the brethren wheresoever his lot may be cast; and may the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep his heart and mind through Christ Jesus. Amen!

Published by order and authority of the church. J. F. ORAM, Clk.

YEARLY MEETINGS IN N. E. OHIO, FOR THE YEAR 1865.

Thompson, Geauga county, 4th Lord's day in June; Mantua, Portage co., 4th Lord's day in June; Alliance, Stark co., 2nd Lord's day in August; East Fairfield, Columbiana co., 3rd Lord's day in Aug.; Warren, Trumbull co., 4th Lord's day in Aug.; ———, Lorain co., 4th Lord's day in Aug.; Bedford, Cuyahoga co., 1st Lord's day in September; Ripley, Wayne and Holmes cos., 1st Lord's day in Sept.; Wadsworth, Summit & Medina cos., 2nd Lord's day in Sept.

These meetings begin on Friday before the respective Lord's days, at 2 o'clock, P. M. A. S. HAYDEN.

GOOD WORDS FROM OUR CORRESPONDENTS.

Bro. Pendleton:—Bro. Treat, of Knox co., reports the labors of himself and Bro. Speer as county Evangelists, with the assistance of others, resulting in 125 additions. Bro. Lord reports 52 added at Laporte. Bro. McIllvaine reports 3 additions at Elm Green. Our dear Bro. Graham, in a private letter from California, says, 140 were added at the State meeting, which was held at Santa Rosa. Good news is coming from all quarters of the land. Let us work, brethren, while the day lasts. In hope, R. L. Howe.

Indianapolis, Ind.

Bro. Pendleton:—I held a meeting of twenty-six days' continuance with the church of Christ in Newburgh, O., where I have been laboring during the last year, resulting in 35 additions to the church—25 immersed.

Yours in Christ, T. M. Green.

Bro. Pendleton:— * * I called with the brethren at Pleasant Hill, Metcalf co., Ky., preached four discourses, had six confessions, and left the brethren rejoicing in the Lord. Fraternally, S. N. Davis.

OBITUARIES.

Bro. Pendleton:—Please give the following a place in the Harbinger, and oblige many friends of Brother and Sister Alexander living in Virginia and the Western States.

Reuben Alexander was born in Henry co., Va., on the 23d of March, 1785; Eliza A. Miller was born in the city of Richmond, on the 18th of November, 1784. They intermarried on Marrowbone Creek, Cumberland co., Ky., on the 8th of August, 1807, and settled on the same place and continued there till their respective deaths. Mrs. Alexander "became obedient to the faith" in 1829; and from that time she lived a pious and godly life till she fell asleep in Jesus, April 6, 1855. She performed all the duties of her station in the family and in society, as well as any sister or lady of the country.

Mr. Alexander was one of the best of business men. He was exact and faithful in all his business transactions. He was a gentleman of the most refined feelings. He was a general reader of books; but particularly of the Bible and the Millennial Harbinger. And though convinced for years of his duty, in consequence of his timidity, he put off "obedience to the faith" till September 15, 1858. But from that date till his death, October 26, 1864, his moral and religious deportment was a living comment on his profession. He was constitutionally and religiously one of the best men I have ever known.—He was greatly afflicted from May, 1858, till his departure for the spirit world—most of the time confined to his room. I knew him well for 36 years—I immersed him—I knew him to be hospitable to strangers and kind to the poor, and I knew *by experience* that his house was a home for many a tired preacher. His great sympathy for suffering humanity, was a marked characteristic of his life. No man has yet lived in Cumberland county, having more friends and fewer enemies than he! I saw him but a few days before his death; and, among other sayings, he said; "I have tried to do *right*—I have done my duty

to the best of my ability—I have nothing to fear—I am in the hands of the Lord, and he will do right."

Brother and Sister Alexander raised a respectable family of four sons and five daughters. Three of the daughters now sleep by the side of their parents; the other two and their four brothers are still living, and greatly lamenting the loss of their kind and noble parents. And that these bereaved ones may profit by the pious life and Christian example of their departed parents, is the ardent desire and sincere prayer of their brother, ISAAC T. RENEAU.

Died, April 25th, 1865, in the 46th year of his age, Bro. Alfred Sanders, an Elder of the Christian church, Davenport, Iowa. He was born in Cincinnati, and emigrated to this city when it was but a small village. He established the Davenport Gazette, and was its chief editor for more than twenty years; and during that time a member of the Christian church. He was a pious and faithful disciple of Christ;—he was always at his post, and contributed by his talents and gifts greatly to the edification of the congregation.

We feel that our loss is his gain. When unable to speak audibly, he asked for writing material. A slate was handed him, and he wrote as his last words, "All is peace."

Also, Died, in this city (Davenport), Sister Mary Parry, at the age of 44.—She was a meek and humble disciple of Christ, intelligent in the Scriptures, and well educated. She abounded in works of charity and beneficence. She died March 31, 1865.

Sister Mary will be better known at the resurrection of the just. J. C.

Another great and good man has gone from this life of trial and labor, to enjoy the saint's reward, a happy home in heaven, and mine is the sad duty to announce the death of Elder JOHN H. HOLTON, who fell asleep in Christ the 23rd inst., in the 66th year of his age.

His illness lasted fifteen days. His sufferings were great, and borne with patience. This announcement will make sad many hearts, to whom he had endeared himself by his labors of love and purity of life. Few have died in whom were blended so happily the highest Christian excellence, fond husband, devoted father, faithful friend, true neighbor, and upright citizen. For more than 30 years he preached the blessed gospel of Christ with a devotion and ability that won many souls to the love and service of the Master whom he honored with a true life's service. It is hard to realize that we shall see him no more here in that circle, where the father and companion came out in their most beauteous forms, and which makes us feel that seldom have children been called upon to mourn the loss of SUCH a father; and few fathers have left behind SUCH children to weep over their memory and grave. But their grief, deep as it is, is assuaged by the remembrance of his life. His children, eight in number, are all in the kingdom of Christ. O, blessed Savior! comfort their hearts, shield them amid life's temptations, and bring them to their heavenly home; where as one unbroken band they, with their father and mother, shall sing the song that makes glad the soul and fills all heaven with purest melody.

GERMANTOWN, Ky., March 27th, 1865. H. B. TAYLOR.

Died, in Holiday's Cove, Brooke co., W. V., on the 25th day of November, 1864, Thomas Brandon, aged 90 yrs. 3 mos. and 11 days. Bro. Brandon has

been a faithful disciple of Jesus Christ for more than 40 years, having been immersed by Bro. Alexander Campbell in Holiday's Cove, in or about the year 1824. A more innocent, child-like character than he never lived in the county in which he died. Many kind words of instruction he gave to the youthful disciples in his pilgrimage journey through life. But with all God's faithful, he is gone. His works will speak though he be dead. J. M.

Died, on the 13th Dec., 1864, at Springville, Ind., after an excruciating illness of ten months, Mrs. Mary Short, wife of Elder M. Short, aged 53 years.

The deceased was brought up in Pulaski co., Ky., and there, at an early age, she became a Christian. In 1836 she emigrated to this place, where, amidst her family and numerous friends, she lived an exemplary life, until so recently called away. Her disease, tumor of the stomach, set at defiance the best medical prescription, while her decline was daily and her sufferings immense; yet no murmuring words or looks arose from that pale sweet countenance, which bore so many traces of unuttered pain. As a faithful lamb, she was resigned; and as a final testimony of undying love, exhorted her sorrowing ones to prepare to join her in the Eden above.

The last moment approached—a saintly smile illumined her features,—then, soft as an angel's whisper, her gentle spirit melted away to mingle in the essences of heaven.

Thus passed away one who possessed an extraordinary intellect—a judgment so clear and penetrating as to seem nearly prophetic—affections deep and exhaustless—and a heart whose chords vibrated to every touch of sorrow. As a faithful, loving wife—a mother so pure and devoted—her memory, fragrant and rich in every good, shall remain embalmed in our hearts forever. L. E. S.

Elmore, Ill., April 28, 1865.

Bro. Pendleton.—At the late meeting of the Illinois State Missionary Society, held at Quincy, the following preamble and resolutions were adopted relative to the death of Bro. P. B. Garrett. You are respectfully requested to insert them in the Harbinger. A. P. Aten, Rec. Sec.

Whereas, It has pleased our Heavenly Father, in his superior knowledge of what is for our good, to call from our midst our very dear brother, Peter B. Garrett of Camp Point, Ill.; Therefore

Resolved, That though deeply regretting the loss of our brother, we humbly submit to this sentence of the Almighty Father: and from the cloudless moral canopy overspreading his past, we are confident he has entered the blissful society of the happy world for which he so diligently labored.

Resolved, That the church has lost in the person of Bro. Garrett an earnest member; the Missionary Society of his State, a steadfast supporter, and his community, an eminently useful and enterprising citizen.

Resolved, That with the tenderest commiseration, we most sincerely sympathize with his family and relatives in their sad bereavement, and do cordially offer them the poor consolation of mutual sorrow.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the family of the deceased, one to the Millennial Harbinger, of which he was long a reader, and also one each to the A. C. Review, Gospel Echo and Christian Herald.

J. S. Sweeney, A. H. Sims, J. R. Frame, Committee.

The Annual Meeting of the Board of Trustees of Bethany College will take place at the Steward's Inn, in Bethany, on Monday, July 3rd, at 10 o'clock A. M. J. A. Campbell, Sec.

THE
MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 36.] BETHANY, W. V., *JULY*, 1865. [No. VII.

ADDRESS

Delivered at the 14th anniversary of the Ohio State Missionary Society, by W. K. Pendleton.

We congratulate you, Christian friends, on the happy auspices that smile upon our meeting at this 14th anniversary of the Ohio State Missionary Society. "Grim-visaged war hath smoothed his wrinkled front," and peace once beams upon our beloved land, blessed and joyful as light from the countenance of God. Let us lift up cheerful hearts before our Preserver, and with gratitude for the past, pledge ourselves to higher devotion for the future. It is a time to acknowledge the wondrous providence with which the Great Ruler has kept us, though we have been called to pass through the fire, and to come with all the precious gifts that are still left us, for sacrifice and offering before the altar of his unfailing mercy. He has been speaking to us at a distance—from the awful heavens;—the voice has come, as from the desolate and gloomy top of Sinai, and it has been,—amid thunderings and lightnings and earthquakes,—the peal of a trumpet sounding loud and long—only the notes of retributive wrath. But we thank thee, O thou Covenant keeping God, the atonement has been made, and Thou art turning again to the people! O, help us to turn, with all that we have, unto Thee.

If we have tears for the past, let them be shed to water for the future. What is grief worth, if it hallow not the heart for a holier consecration to high and noble service under Him, who, through chastisement, leads us to the peaceable fruits of righteousness! Selfish sorrow is a repining that wins no blessing. The heart that springs not

up with glad rebound from the heavy blows of adversity, is but "as the poison tree, which, though pierced to the inmost, weeps but tears of poison." Bitter regrets yield nothing but bitter fruits. It is the *office* of true repentance to bury the dead works of the past, and fit the soul for a regeneration into a nobler life:—it is the office of mighty judgments to open new fields for regenerated laborers:—it is the office of the church to enter these fields, and work them. Do we look upon the ruin of four years, over which desolation has swept her besom, and death held her bloody carnival! What can we see! The nameless graves of the uncoffined dead, or perhaps the bleaching bones of dear ones, whom we shall meet again, nevermore! Gloomy silence hangs over the furrowed battlefield, and the heroes that made them immortal are gone;—Some lie beneath,—Some are coming back to tell us of those that fell; but is this all that we see? Is the spectacle only a vision of death! Then to us has the sacrifice been paid in vain. We have given our first born only to grace an arena of strife and cover the earth with murder. O, gloomy are these fields of blood to him who gazes upon them only to weep over the lost. Your dead and mine cry to us from the ground and call us to make their sacrifice a purification for the hearts of the living. If we stand, as selfish mourners, weeping for our children because they are not, we will not be comforted. By their toils and sufferings, we are called to toil and suffer, and in noble works for humanity and God shall the heart find its only satisfaction. From the scar in the rock burst the refreshing stream of the desert; from the pierced side of Jesus flowed the sin-atoning blood of the Lamb; and shall not our own bleeding hearts turn to Him who has smitten us, with sweeter, truer service, and bring an incense of gratitude and praise whose fragrance shall rise to heaven, and make glad the city of our God!

Becomes it not us, then, "in this glorious summer time of peace," to look over the fields of our future conflicts, and inquire, "What are the things that are wanting?" Let this then be our theme—"What are the things that are wanting?" We know the past; we ought to survey the present, and wisely forecast the future. For forty years we have been struggling for reform, laboring with head and heart and hand to restore and establish the original simplicity and power of the gospel. Preachers—learned and unlearned, eloquent and rude—filled with the fire of a divine inspiration, have caught up the plea, and in season and out of season, in order and out of order, thundered it in the ears alike people and of priest, till human systems are giving way—effete fabrics of ecclesiasticism crumbling beneath the weapons of our warfare, (which are not carnal, but mighty, through God, for the overthrowing of strongholds,) and to-day we find ourselves a myriad

host, with numbers and means and zeal and unity adequate to move the earth for our cause, "casting down reasonings and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, and leading captive every thought to the obedience of Christ." Verily our sound has gone forth into all the earth, and our words to the end of the world. It is the Lord's doing, and marvelous in our sight.

This might of numbers and of means—this fervor of focal zeal and strength of knitted unity—this vantage ground of apostolic order—this triumphant march of the pure gospel through the fortresses of a a strong-rooted sectarianism—this moving host of a people-priesthood harnessed for victory and greedy for triumph—what does it lack?—Do you say, Nothing? Are we satisfied with the past—are we contented with the present—can we see no improvement for the future? O people thus favored of the Lord, much has been given to us; let us remember that therefore, much also is required of us. In this hour of rest from stormy conflict, under the arching bow of the tranquil heavens, once more bright above us, let us sit down for a moment and take counsel for the work that is yet given us to do.

There is work within and work without;—work to be done in marshaling our forces—work to be done in conquering our foes—work in the church, for the church—work in the world, for the world. Let us not in haughty self-sufficiency refuse to see it, nor in criminal infidelity, shrink from its performance.

The spirit of Christianity is a spirit of reformation. It impresses this feature upon all on whom even the shadow of its influence falls. It breathes its heavenly freedom into the heart of human benevolence; it lends its influence to the working brain of the statesman; it sheds its luster over the uprising movements of civilization; it gives subtlety to science, and beauty to art. It enters the domestic circle and changes woman from a mere hand-engine for the distaff and the loom, into a sweet divinity for the hearth—a haunting presence of heavenly grace—tuning the prattle of infancy into divine harmony, and wreathing around the rugged nature of manhood the beauty and sweetness of a holier life. It steals into the garden of the humble cottage, and beside the nightshade and the rue, rears up the myrtle and the amaranth; and hovering over castle and cathedral, high above turret and dome, points its heavenward finger to the mansions in the skies:—and there, from its high abode, it calls to the church with the eternal summons—onward—upward—even unto perfection! Alas for the man that will not hear its voice;—who, squatting down behind some cherished memory of "forty years ago," croaks "innovation, innovation" against all who, with countenance erect, see brighter things yet in our future, and have the manliness and fidelity to plead for their accom-

plishment. We ask for no innovation; we seek to introduce none. We plead for reformation. We want to perfect the things that are wanting. We desire to see the church put on her beautiful garments, and stand forth all glorious as a bride adorned for her husband.

First of all, we need more of the spirit of Christ—gentleness, courtesy, forbearance. In our social intercourse, in our public assemblies, in our editorial labors, in our ministerial bearing, in our conduct towards the world—everywhere—the Christian should be the highest style and type of man. He should walk as seeing God. Great thoughts should give him dignity, high aims should give him elevation, heavenly communion should shed over his life the loveliness and grace of heavenly society, and meditation on the divine love should draw him with a brother's heart to all men. Public men particularly should remember to "adorn the teaching of God our Savior in all things." The world has its own way of judging of the value of Christianity. It is influenced more by the life and character of professors, often, than by their arguments. Especially are our public assemblies looked to as the truest exponents of what we are. We naturally think but little of a people who meet together to wrangle—who seek such occasions as arenas for the gladiatorial sports of party polemics, or the still more unworthy conflicts of personal rivalry. If Paul thought it a shame for the Corinthian Christians to go to law with one another before the civil tribunals, how circumspect ought we to be in the conduct of our private differences. Our public meetings should not be disgraced by proceedings that gender strife, and that are foreign to the end and aim of their organization. The largest charity should be extended to differences of opinion, and brethren should be received now as in apostolic days, without regard to such things. Parliamentary order is but good sense and polite behavior applied to the action of public assemblies. To facilitate business, to secure a calm and thorough consideration of all proposed measures, to keep men, even in the heats of controversy, strictly within the bounds of gentlemanly courtesy, and to compel a sacred regard to the legitimate business of the organization to which they are applied—these are among the prominent objects for which manuals of parliamentary order are compiled; and no one of even moderate experience or observation can fail to see their high utility.

"Let all things be done decently and in order," is a precept but too little considered; in fact, by many but half understood. *Decently*, as we now use the word, but very imperfectly represents the original. The apostle is enjoining the broadest rule of Christian propriety. He would have us consider our high calling, rise to a sense of the dignity and grandeur of a holy convocation of kings and priests unto God, and act

in harmony with these honorable relations. "In the high and palmy state of Rome," her Senate excited the admiration and won the respect of the world;—when our own country was united and pure, the Senate of the United States was proudly pointed to as the embodiment of wisdom, eloquence and patriotic statesmanship; and so should the Christian representative assemblies exhibit the honor, the purity, the nobility, the intelligence, the Christian spirit of the body of Christ, so that those who come amongst us to mock, shall go away to praise.

We are by nature finite creatures—we see in part and we know but in part. Our selfish and narrow education, under the tuition of the world, makes us still more so, and when we come together from many different localities, we naturally bring with us our *shibboleths* of fellowship, which are often all of the flesh, and in the old spirit of the Gileadites, we are for putting to the sword every man that cannot pronounce *shib* just as we do. So a thick tongue, or a curly head, or a white skin becomes our crime, and ethnography, or geography determines our charity and grades our fellowship. Sectarianism has already nearly exhausted the copious resources of our language to to name its divisions, but we still need new designations for new parties and I shall not be surprised if history will yet have to tell posterity, of the rise and fall of the "*Mason and-Dixon-line-ites.*"—But as neiiher Christ nor his apostles anticipated the running of this line, and there is clearly no "thus saith the Lord" for it, we, as true Reformers, standing on the Bible, and the Bible alone, cannot admit it as a basis of faith or a boundary of fellowship.

But seriously, should not our limited range of sympathies, our consciousness of bondage to narrow and unworthy prejudices, and the sense of difficulty we experience in our efforts to expand the soul to the divine and comprehensive charity which the gospel teaches, and which was so gloriously illustrated in the life of Paul, make us modest in our bearing towards our brethren, distrustful of the righteousness of our own arrogant pretensions to superiority, and ready to embrace, in a sublime charity, and without respect to differences of opinion, all who love our Lord and Savior Jesus Chist, and serve him according to the positive requirements of his holy and revealed will? O for the spirit of Paul, which *loving* the Jew with the prejudice of a Pharisee, could yet *renounce* the Jew, by the Spirit of Christ, and throw his mighty heart out broadly over the whole brotherhood of man, and go forth, a herald of the Cross, to preach the gospel to every creature! A convocation of Christians under the burthen of this message must bring with it the power of God. In such an assembly all regenerated hearts will cry "It is good for us to be here,"

and unbelievers, "falling down will worship God, and report that God is really among you."

Pardon me, brethren, if I have seemed to dwell somewhat too long on this subject. I introduce it at the suggestion of your Board, and, important as it may be in itself, feel that it becomes me to say, that *I insert it by request.*

But while our public assemblies should exhibit and promote our unity, and cement our brotherly love; restrict their action, rigidly and simply, to the legitimate and Catholic purposes of Christian co-operation; cultivate and excite the public respect and confidence, and maintain and seek to develop the dignity and courtesy of a royal and priestly people—there are yet higher and more beneficent ends to be aimed at and accomplished. The paramount purpose of these holy convocations, is to organize and utilize our resources for the work of missions. Every congregation is a missionary society, within the *sphere* of its influence, and all the congregations co-operating in a united exertion of their power, is a missionary society for the *world.*—The development of Christian life and activity in the several churches, therefore, is pressed upon us, as one primary interest to be considered; and the wise and energetic employment of these, for the wider operations of general missionary work, is another no less important concern for our prayerful and earnest action.

It cannot be denied that, while we have a numerous brotherhood and many churches, our efficiency, whether for perfecting the saints or converting sinners, is comparatively small. We have the elements of great power, but it is not developed. We have a numerous host, but it is not disciplined. We have many churches, but we have not taken care to provide for them "the things that are wanting." They are in too many cases, as sheep without a shepherd. Most of them, indeed, have the form of organization, but are without its power.—They have elders, but not the range of qualifications in their body, that the scriptures require. Will brethren bear with me, when I say that the crying want of the churches to-day is the functionary, who in the Scriptures is called a pastor—a member in and of every eldership, who shall tend the flock, feed the flock, lead the flock, teach the flock, and gently and lovingly keep them from straying from the fold of Christ. We have, with a zeal for proselyting, which is worthy of all praise, recruited the hosts of Israel, with a rapidity of success that is beyond a parallel. Our activity in this direction, has been remarkable, considering how few have been the public laborers that have been employed, and how small the pecuniary expense, that has been incurred. But whilst we have used so successfully the power of a preached gospel, we have not kept up a parallel care for

those who have been gathered into the fold. In many places, where churches have been planted, and where they flourished for a season, we not only find ourselves called to mourn over the comparative desolation that has swept over them, but have to lament, too often, the disgrace of the cause itself, which has resulted from the backslidings and bickerings of its neglected professors. How often do our evangelists encounter such ruins, and how hard and unwelcome do they find the task of clearing away the rubbish, laying anew the foundation, and gathering again the material for a better building. They find that others have gone before them, and "planted," but no one has been left to "water," and consequently God has given no increase.

This waste of labor,—this discouraging loss of accessions so laboriously made to our ranks has been often lamented by some of our most efficient evangelists, and they have sometimes said in sad disappointment at such results,, "Better not to make converts at all,—better to leave off recruiting and attend to the discipline of the numbers we have." We do not wonder at this feeling—but this is not the remedy. Do not let us suspend our work of proselyting;—abate not one scruple of our zeal or labor in gathering in the rich harvest that is calling so loudly all over the land for the reapers; but let us make provision for the pastoral labor, which the increase of the flock so imperiously demands. Convert all we can, take care of all we convert. Let this be our motto. What! shall it be said that our very success has proved our ruin! That in the hour of our triumph, we are to let the fruits of victory slip from our hands, for the want of wisdom and fidelity in providing for its preservation! We shall plead for better things. Forty years of glorious work has given us numbers—it has not given us pastors in all the churches to take care of these numbers, and this is one of "the things that are wanting."

I am not one of those who are fond of boasting of our numbers.—There are some, I fear, who delight in this exercise, too much after the spirit that was reproved in David. But there is something expanding to the soul in the knowledge, that the Lord's people are many; that the servants of our God, who are sealed on their foreheads, are a great multitude, that no one can number, out of all nations and tribes and peoples and tongues, standing before the throne, and before the Lamb, bright in their bridal array and resplendent with victory. It is refreshing to think, that out of much tribulation, we have come to a season of prosperity,—and to us, who were not discouraged by the day of small things, it may be permitted to look with gratification on the swelling columns that express our growth and our strength. But let it not be in idle vanity nor boastful self-confidence. The measure

of our strength is the measure of our responsibility. Let not our exultation be, that we are strong, but being strong, that we are capable of and must perform a mighty work for the Lord.

Is it an overestimate to say that we number, to-day, three hundred thousand souls united in our plea for reformation, and standing together for the proclamation and defense of apostolic Christianity? We trust it is not. It will be safe, at least, to say that in a total population of the United States, which in five years from this, will be *forty-two millions*, we number *one* to every *one hundred and forty* of the whole. If every disciple were in his life and conversation a preacher of the Cross, and separated unto his little congregation of 140, how easy it would be for us to be seen and heard of all men.—But this is not so. We are not and cannot be thus distributed; but worse than this, how many of us are conspicuous only for dead works; whose example is not only a reproach to the Cross, but a libel on the Gospel of God.

Our *three hundred thousand members*, we will suppose, are collected into some five thousand congregations. How many of these are furnished with an Eldership that contains a pastor?—one who goes from house to house, a minister of grace, carrying with him the sweet influences of a ripened piety, and establishing an altar for family offerings beside every hearth-stone; an ensample to the flock, reverenced, though not called "reverend," by our children; turning the hearts of the disciples from the world to God; a man "blameless, as the steward of God; not self-willed, not passionate, not fond of wine, not quarrelsome, not one who makes money by base means; but hospitable, a lover of goodness, sober-minded, just, holy, temperate, holding fast the sure word as it is taught, that he may be able by sound teaching, both to exhort and convince the opposers." (Titus 1: 7–9.)

Titus was left in Crete, that he might ordain elders in every city, so that the churches might be furnished with this aid for their edification, that they might, as living stones, be built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, offering up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ. (1 Pet. 2: 5.) When we have planted churches, have we taken care always thus to organize them? Need I answer this question? It is true that in most of our congregations we have what we call Elders; that is, by some sort of an election we have designated certain persons to be called by this *title*. We give the *name*, but do we give the *grace* of the office? How many of those whom we call Elders are consecrated to their work by even the outward form of ordination? The world requires of even its humblest officers, at least an oath of office, and some ceremony of consecration by which he is

made to feel the responsibility of his trust; but in the Christian church, which is the pillar and support of the truth, men straggle into and straggle out of the highest places, we scarcely know how nor wherefore, with but little appreciation of the dignity, save of the *title*, and with less sense of the duties and obligations which they assume. Let us insist on the uniform rule of Scripture, that the Elders must be ordained; and in the act of ordination, let us see to it that the men set before us for office are competent, and make them feel by the solemnities of a formal consecration, that they are pledging themselves before God and in the presence of the people to discharge faithfully and zealously the high trust committed to their keeping.

It is demonstrable by our own experience, that a neglect to insist upon the scriptural requirements for the selection and ordination of Elders, has resulted in the degradation of the office. Disciples have come to think that it is a small thing to make Elders, and consequently they make very small things of them. Men whom we appoint to administer our temporal affairs, are invested, in our eyes, with high dignity. Their office

> "———— shows the force of temporal power,
> The attribute to awe and majesty,
> Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings;—

but in the Christian church, office is divested of much that makes it useful, by the irreverence in which it is held. In dehorting against "reverend" as a clerical title, we seem to have struck a blow at the feeling of reverence itself. We would not have elders, pastors, or teachers called "Reverend," simply because they are not so called in the Scriptures; still, we would have them reverenced as the ministers of God. The word means simply to turn towards one with deference and respect. Wives are commanded to be subject to their husbands, not in slavish submission, but in reverence; in a deference and respect which spring from admiration and love. Reverence is in fact the *principle* of Christian subjection. "We have had fathers of our flesh who corrected us," says Paul, "and we gave them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of our spirits, and live?" (Heb. 12: 9.) Thus we are to obey those who rule over us, and be submissive; for they watch for our souls, as those who must give account; that they may do this with joy, and not with grief: for this would be (may we not say, *has been?*) fatal to us. (Heb. 13: 17.)

A want of reverence for official rank and worth is one of the characteristic sins of the American people. If we respect not him who represents the government, we despise the authority of the government; and when we despise the authority, we will not scruple to break the

law. This has been but too sadly demonstrated in the history of the last few years, to need other illustration. Still we show even more respect to the officers of our temporal organization, than we do to those of the everlasting kingdom of our blessed Lord. Look back but a few months, and see the countless multitudes that poured into our national Capital to witness the inauguration of the late lamented President. How the popular heart went up in respect towards the man whom they delighted to honor! With banners and music, and pomp of a nation's festival, he was welcomed to his high office, and hailed with the reverence of an admiring people's heart. They expressed in this demonstration more than the merited tribute of distinguished personal worth; they looked beyond the man, and reverenced above himself the officer of their choice. And when a few short weeks afterwards he was stricken down at his post, murdered, not because he was a man, but because he was an officer—our chief officer in the earnest discharge of the duties to which the people had called him—fallen not under his work, but in the midst of it—who can depict the startling agony with which the nation cried:—

"O friends, our chief State oracle is mute!"

"Lead out the pageant: sad and slow,
As fits an universal woe,
Let the long, long procession go,
And let the sorrowing crowd about it grow,
And let the mournful martial music blow;
The last great President is low."

O that we could feel too, as we ought, the might, the majesty and the glory of the kingdom of Christ! and render to the representatives of her power the reverence that is due to those who shall judge the angels: that we could look beyond the seen, and behold the dignity and glory that await those for whom they are called to minister, and appreciate, in the grandeur of their triumphs, the office of those who watch for their souls during the conflict. They that overcome, shall eat of the tree of life which is in the paradise of God; they shall wear the crown of life, and the second death shall not hurt them; they shall eat of the hidden manna, and a white stone shall be given to them, engraved with a new and mystic name, known only to them; they shall have authority over the nations, and he will give them the morning star; they shall be clothed in white raiment, and their names enrolled in the book of life, shall be proclaimed aloud before the Father and before his angels; they shall be made everlasting pillars in the temple of God, and emblazoned with the glory of his name; they shall sit with Christ upon his throne, and be with him in royal dignity and dominion, as he is with the Father, forever and forevermore:

and yet, with all their luster and immortal honors, they shall be set as gems in the coronet of those who here upon the earth, in the humble walks of pastoral labor, won them from the error of their way, and brought them to Christ. Glorious inauguration, when they that shall be kings and priests unto God, shall be conducted to their thrones and decked with their starry crowns!

There is no greater work than that of elevating humanity—no higher honor than that which springs from doing this work faithfully and well. This is the true work of the church—through the incarnate Deity to raise humanity to fellowship with God. Her public agents in this great work are the Elderships in the Congregations, and the Evangelists in the field. Suppose we had our five thousand Elderships all working steadily, faithfully, zealously, unitedly for the same great end, who can estimate the result of such a work! But then, add to these an adequate corps of Evangelists, to be kept constantly on the wing, with the glad tidings which are for all people eloquent on their lips, and what conquests would gladden the church! I do not know how many congregations we have in the State of Ohio. It is a great State, and the church ought to be strong in such a population. You have, however, fifteen hundred and sixteen cities and towns, and we ought to have a church in every one of them. Traveling through such a people, and coming every few miles upon neat and prosperous looking villages, we are naturally disappointed if, upon inquiry, we hear that there is no Christian church in some of them. In some of them, it may be, the plea that we are making for the restoration of primitive Christianity has never been heard. Now, supposing that an Evangelist can hold, on an average, twenty protracted meetings in a year, it would require only seventy-five such preachers to carry the gospel, in a single year, into all the towns and cities of your State—to hold a protracted meeting in every center of this vast population. Or, to vary the calculation, your have now a population of 2,750,000. Of this, there will be 750,000 who are under the age of 10 years. Seventy-five evangelists, then, constantly engaged, will afford a protracted meeting once a year for every 1333 persons of your population, who may be supposed to be capable of hearing and obeying the gospel. If we make allowance for the evangelical labor that could be performed by teachers and pastors located in particular congregations, perhaps we could reduce the number of regularly employed evangelists to *fifty*, and accomplish still the work of affording one protracted meeting for the purpose of proselyting, to every 1333 souls of your population to whom the offer of salvation should be made. Is it too sanguine a hope to indulge, that through the auspices of this Society this result may soon be reached! What a glorious harvest would

such a corps of laborers gather in a single year. Fifteen hundred protracted meetings, with an average addition of twenty converts to the meeting, would give us just thirty thousand souls for our reward. Think of this, brethren, and stir up the generous spirit of the apostolic age once more in our midst. Let us have not only apostolic truth, but apostolic zeal and apostolic victories.

But you say, Where are all these Pastors and Evangelists to come from? I am glad that you ask this question. You *need* them. That is plain enough. Happy shall I be, if I have succeeded in some degree in exciting you to *desire* them. The law of supply and demand is as imperious and potent as the law of gravity. Only let the church strongly demand them, and she will soon have them. A few years ago, many persons asked a similar question as to officers for the mighty army which sprung up, as if by magic, to vindicate and maintain our unity as a government; but the demand soon created the supply. So it will be in this case. The fact is, the disciples have never seriously asked for these men. Let us not forget, that if we deeply and earnestly feel the need of them, they can be had. But how? Can earnest wishes bring them? No, but earnest and generous hearts can create them. Besides the few we have, many more are to be made; for these men need qualification. A man cannot be a pastor nor an evangelist by ecclesiastical fiat. He must be educated for his work. I do not deem it necessary to argue this proposition before this audience. Every calling has its appropriate instruction and discipline. The mechanic, the artist, the physician, the lawyer, the teacher, even of arithmetic, is compelled to prepare himself by special study and training, for his work; but preachers, it seems, are called and sent without any previous preparation. An English satirist has wittily said,—

> "A man must serve his time to every trade
> Save censure—critics all are ready made."

Practically, one would think that some of our scribes and church edificators had come to the same conclusion as to preachers and pastors. But we will not deceive ourselves. Pastors and teachers must themselves be taught and trained. Evangelists should not be sent out until they are fit to go.

But how are we to educate them? How do you educate your son for a lawyer? Do you need any special revelation to tell you how to fit a young man for usefulness to himself and others in any of the arts or callings in the world? Surely not. Yet, unless we find some precept or example in the Scriptures for educating our church ministers, the oracle from the mummy of forty years ago lifts his awful finger and shrieks, "Innovation, innovation." Well, we have about come

to the conclusion that this oracle does not exactly know what it is talking about. We are not right sure that *we* know what it means by innovation; but we do know that the church needs more pastors and teachers and evangelists, and that they must be educated. How shall it be done? is the question next before us; and to this allow me very briefly to address myself.

We know how our Savior educated the primitive disciples. He took them about with him, and by oral instruction and the power of his own example, taught and trained them for their work. We know how Paul was educated. He was first brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, thoroughly instructed in the law, the types and true significance of which he has so marvelously unfolded, and then he was specially instructed by the Savior as to his mission to the Gentiles. We know how Timothy was educated. Though the son of a Greek, he was piously brought up on his mother's side, through the motherly care of those immortal women, Lois his grandmother, and Eunice his mother, and having won a good report of the brethren in Lystra and Iconium, he was taken up by Paul, circumcised on account of the Jews, and associated with the apostle in his travels, for special instruction. Paul tells the whole story when he so affectionately reminds him of their intimacy, in his second pastoral letter to him.—"But you have known my teaching," says he, "my course of life, my purpose, my faithfulness, my long-suffering, my love, my patience, my persecutions, my sufferings, which came upon me in Antioch, in Iconium, in Lystra; you well know what persecutions I endured: and yet out of them all, the Lord delivered me. * * * Continue in the things which you have learned and well understood, knowing from whom you learned them, and that from a child you have known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make you wise unto salvation, through faith that is in Christ Jesus." (II Tim. 3: 10–15.)

From these examples we take our lesson. We begin with the mothers, for, unfortunately, for us, too many of the fathers, even in the church, are still Greeks, so far as choosing a calling for their sons, is concerned. They inspire them with the spirit of the world, rather than with the spirit of Christ, and turn their aspirations to the farm, to commerce, to medicine, to law, to politics, anything rather than to the ministry of the church. For the true Timothies we must still look to the mothers. Begin early with your boys. Teach them to love and reverence the ministers of the gospel and to feel the greatness and the glory of their calling; fill their young hearts with the love of the Savior, and their young minds with his precious word; inspire them with a thirst for divine truth; burthen their souls with the mighty responsibilities that spring from the cross; train their

young necks to the yoke that is easy and the burthen that is light; let them see that your heart is yearning to fit them for the public service of the church, and that in all your fond dreams of their future, you figure them standing in faith and purity about her altars, and offering the sacrifices of humble human hearts, won from their strayings and brought back to the way of life by their eloquence and zeal.

O mothers, great is your mission among men! We never forget your early lessons. They are our heart's heart. They come, like your own yearning reminiscence of lost Eden's bloom, to throw their fragrance and their purity over the arid and poisoned ways of our rugged life; they steal upon us in the hour of our temptations, like gentle whisperings from the spirit land; they come to refresh us, like the wells and the palm-trees of Elim, when we are ready to perish in the desert; and when, on the stormy battle-field, death strikes us down with his red hand of blood, they are sweeter to us than the shout of victory, and holy as the prayer, in which they taught us to commit ourselves to the love and the mercy of God. O mother, mine, from whose gentle eyes these have been shut out for now four dreary years, by the lurid cloud of war, if, through all its agonies, thy firm but tender heart is yet unbroken, to thee let me render this tribute due to thy surpassing love, and lay at thy feet, the gratitude I owe, for what, through the grace of God, I am enabled, this day, to do or say for the honor and glory of his name!

Before we can be called or sent, we must be willing to go. If we begin with our children when they are young we will better succeed in making them willing. And when we find them willing, we will with greater confidence undertake the special training and instruction which they will need to fit them for their work. One great means of effecting this, is put into the hands of the pastors themselves.—They know all the members of their congregations of course, and wherever they find a young man, with any hopeful promise of fitness for this life, let them take him under special tuition—as Paul did Timothy; show him the walks of Zion; take him to the prayer-meeting and call him out in the exercise of his gifts; conduct him to the bed of affliction, and permit him to weep with them that weep; engage with him in the study of the Scriptures; commune with him on the great interests of the kingdom and engage him to help in the care of its affairs;—keep his thoughts on the things that are above; impress him with the conviction that the Lord needs him, that he has purchased him with a great price, for his own service,; that it is a solemn duty which pastors and evangelists owe to the great Head of of the church, to "Commit the things, which are in their keeping, to

faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also;"—and in this way, each one may raise up not one, but often many, to carry on the work of the Master's Kingdom.

Evangelists too should seek ever to imitate the example of Paul, and take a young brother along with them for training and instruction. Let them thus be initiated into the methods of the pulpit; taught by the light of personal example how to behave themselves in the church of God; and practically trained in the art of conducting protracted meetings. Thus every Evangelist should be an educator of young men to labor in other fields, and carry the conquest of the Cross abroad in the earth. Of course, we will be understood as speaking only and strictly of professional education. An evangelist cannot be expected to undertake the more elementary literary instruction, which is provided for in our schools and Colleges. This, we presume to have been enjoyed in advance—but besides and beyond this, many things are necessary to make an efficient and acceptable preacher,—one who will do credit to himself and bring success to the cause of our Lord. In these ways, more or less perfectly employed many good and useful men have been added to the ministry of the church, but the question still arises, Will this provide all that we want? Will it supply, with certainty and regularity, as many as we want,—or will it afford an adequate means of furnishing men with all the qualifications, that are needed. Experience compels us to answer both of these question in the negative. Some ampler and more thorough means must be employed. What shall it be? I give my opinion, with the more confidence, because I feel that my experience will find a response in yours—and that the wants which I have noticed, have been pressed also upon your attention.

1st. Then, We want the means of imparting a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures, in their original tongues. The Hebrew Bible the Septuagint and the New Testament should be thoroughly taught to at least such of our young preachers, as have the talent and the industry to master them. They should know all about the history and fortunes of these sacred writings, and understand how to translate and criticise them.

2nd. The means of thorough instruction in Church History, the History of Doctrines, the History of polemics; Christian morals and Ethics, and the Scriptural system of church Polity or government.

3rd. Constant and practical instruction in Sacred Rhetoric; the composition and delivery of Sermons; Exercises in Extemporaneous Speaking; Instruction in Homiletics, or the Science of adapting the Scriptures in pulpit treatment to the instruction and edification of the

people; and last, though not least, thorough instruction and training in the practical duties and labors of pastoral life.

I may say, that as at present organized and conducted, none of our colleges furnish the means for fully supplying our wants in any of these essential particulars. True, in some we teach the Hebrew language, and give such students as desire it, instruction in the Greek of the New Testament, but it is only partially done: in some, too, we have lectures on the Bible, as a text book, but this again is an *extra* study, that is subordinate—necessarily so, in connection with the ordinary academic course of our colleges—to those studies which constitute the main items in the regular literary curriculum. Bethany College, despite of her embarrassments, has done what she could in this direction, and with near a score of her sons standing around me in your midst here to-day, I feel that she has no reason to be ashamed of her part. But I repeat, these efforts are necessarily subordinate. We would not have them subordinate, but superadded, as the crowning work in the education of such of our preachers as have the industry, ability and desire to fit themselves thoroughly for any and all the demands that may be made upon a preacher of the gospel in this enlightened and generally educated 19th century of the Christian era.

We will not tax your polite attention by any discussion of the value and importance of such a course of instruction as I have indicated. I submit the matter to an honest decision, by simply asking the question, "Is there a preacher here to-day, who has not enjoyed these opportunities that does not say to himself, Would that I could have had all these advantages to fit me for my work." If to-day we had such a College, commanding the confidence of the brotherhod, and true to the principles of our reformation, would not hundreds of young men seek to enter it walls? Such as might not be able to prosecute the Linguistic studies prescribed, would still be eager to get the benefit of so much of the course as requires only a tolerable English education, and even seniors in the gospel phalanx, would, many of them, not scruple to come to it, to enrich their treasury of knowledge in the things that so directly and exclusively pertain to the successful prosecution of their calling. Brethren we have numbers and we have wealth adequate for these provisions;—we *need* them with a sure and pressing demand,—shall we not have the generosity and the providence to establish them? The scheme, to be successful, must be accessible to all who are worthy—it must be like the gospel, *free*. We must endow the professorships, and create free scholarships for the students. I speak freely and faithfully to you in this public council, what I feel and know to be our great need, and leave yon to consider, whether or not you will set in order this "thing that is wanting."

I am aware that we have a few teachers among us, and a knot of small scribes, who prick up their ears with alarm whenever we talk about college-bred preachers, and I speak with the knowledge, but not the fear of these before my eyes. They speak from the mists of prejudice, and delude themselves and a few who listen to them by a system of special pleading, that is too narrow to stand the shock of enlightened investigation. Because we have had a few young men that have enjoyed the advantages of college instruction, who have turned aside to useless and even injurious speculations, they argue against college-bred students generally. Suppose we apply the principle to preachers who have not been college-bred. How is it with these? Have none of these abandoned the faith? Come up, my objecting friend, with your examples of the college-breds, and I will engage to cite you their parallels, ten to one, who are not college-breds. I say, look at this one, and that one, and the other—how they have disgraced the cause. It is because they were not trained in a college,—down with all such,—let us have no preachers but such as have a college training! This is your principle, friend, not mine, but I show you with what damaging effect it will turn against you in the hands of a logician. It is the every day fallacy of mistaking a concomitant for a cause. The fact is, these aberrations come from the natural perversity of the human heart, or darkness of the human understanding, and are not to be charged either to a college education or the want of it.

We shall take fairer and profounder views of it. Experience, I trust, and a growing sense of our responsibility for the perfection and efficiency of the church, will lead us into larger views and a more liberal and providential policy. I am pleading with you for the wise employment of the means with which the blessing of heaven has so bountifully endowed us. We have come to a stage in the development of our triumphant movement of reformation, that calls upon us to renew our work, and provide for it the instruments and the agents by which it may be carried on to still greater advantage. I believe we shall not be found wanting in the day of our trial, but that now necessity is upon us, we will rise with the strength of the Timnite conqueror and burst the withes of prejudice, that our hands may be free for the work which we find for them to do. I do not feel discouraged. Whilst we do not despise the day of small things, neither will we throw away the opportunity of great things. I have faith in the intelligence and generosity, the Christian fidelity of my brethren; I have faith in the heaven-appointed destiny of the church; faith in the sleepless guardianship, the invincible leadership of the great Captain of salvation. Amid the convulsions of the nation, we have stood

united, because we were founded on "the Rock"; and with increased confidence in ourselves, and renewed devotion to our cause, let us pledge ourselves anew to one another and to our blessed Savior, to stand together in one mind and one heart, for the glory, the extension and the triumph of his kingdom. Many are the examples that urge us from behind—bright the visions that open before us. Let us catch the inspiration which they give. The voice of many of the first pleaders of this cause is now hushed in the silent dust, but though dead, they still speak, and in example live. Can we stand by their graves and think of their great and noble work, and fail to vow eternal fidelity to its interests? Can we let the grey headed fathers, who are soon to leave us, go down in the conflict and carry with them the gloomy tidings that the garden of their planting, blesssed with their prayers and watered with their tears, is passing into a desert wilderness, because of our neglect? No! Bright cloud of glorified witnesses, we will not forget that your anxious eyes behold us—that from your ranks on the shining shore, you are watching us in the work you have left us to do, and cheering us on to coming and certain victory. We will not disappoint you. We accept the heaven-born battle in which you so bravely fought and nobly won. Bequeathed from hero sires to worthy sons, true hearts shall still be found to carry it on to ultimate triumph. The church *shall be* glorious as a bride, and adorned in beauty for the coming of her husband. With the help of God, we will set in order "these things that are wanting."

CHRONICLES.

The old town is still standing—now a city—in which I spent my early days. It is beautifully situated. The country around it is rich and productive in all that contributes to the comfort and prosperity of a people. Indeed, no spot on earth have I seen which combines so many advantages for a happy, quiet home, as Lexington, Ky. It is endeared to me by a thousand pleasant recollections and sweet and tender memories. It was my home. It was there I first heard the sound of the Gospel, and felt its quickening power. I preached my first discourse in the old Baptist meeting house in that city. The subject was—"What think ye of Christ?" I began my public ministry with Christ as my theme. It has been the key note of all that I have chanted, from that day to this. I shall close my life with it sounding on my lips. Whatever variations have run through the *Oratorio*, this note has always sounded out clearly and distinctly.—Whatever success I have had in preaching the Word, may be justly traced to this. Christ and Him crucified, are the converting elements

of the Gospel. But it is Christ first—then him crucified. The more we know of the Messiah and study his life and character, the more we love him; and this love will make us talk of him, think of him, preach him, tenderly, touchingly, truly. I would say to every young preacher,—"Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession—Jesus the Messiah." *Consider* him; let him be your "Alpha and Omega." He is the entire alphabet of the gospel you should preach, its first and last letter, and all that lies between. You need not fear that either you or your hearers will ever tire or grow weary in dwelling on this theme. Do you ever turn away with disgust from the old spring that gushes from the hill side at your door? Its waters are as fresh and inviting now as they were in the days of your childhood. Indeed, you think them better, since you have tasted other fountains. "O that I had water from the well of Bethlehem," said the hero, David. The memories of childhood when a shepherd boy, haunted him like a presence in the heat of battle. Who ever was weary of hearing Walter Scott dwell on the great themes of the Gospel, or John A. Gano in his masterly eloquence, when Jesus and him crucified rung like a trumpet peal upon the ears of their auditors? There are some notes that never die. Struck once, they live "for aye."—"A thing of beauty is a joy forever." The poets always find hearers, when love is the theme. It is ever new, because it is old.—"God is love." And what fountain is so deep and full, so clear and inexhaustible, as that which is found in Christ and him crucified. It is the river of Ezekiel—so shallow that a child may lave his foot in it—so deep that Leviathan may swim. It is an infinite ocean of fullness.

The old meeting-house, where I sat under the preaching of Dr. Fishback, long since perished—if I remem ber right with fire. A ne one was erected in its place, and other men arose who "knew not Joseph." The old Doctor was a famous man in his day. He was cut for a great man. In some respects he was a giant, in others a pigmy. He was, in his knowledge of the Gospel, far above his compeers, and greatly beyond his age. How much we as a people are indebted to him, only eternity will disclose. I know of but one thing in which he was deficient, and that was the design of immersion; but in this he was greatly in advance of all the Baptist preachers in his day. He united with the Disciples at the close of his life, and died in the faith. Dear old man! how I loved him! He was my friend, my guide, my patron, my counsellor! He not only immersed me into Christ, but encouraged me to give my life to his service as an Evangelist. Never shall I forget his kind, loving, gentle and Christian wife. She was a model wife for a Christian minister. Many

happy hours and days have I spent in her family. But both the Doctor and his dear companion have gone from us. Well, it will be a blessed thing to meet them and such as these in the land beyond the river. J. C.

ROMANISM AND RELIGIOUS TOLERATION.

"The Right Rev. M. Dornence, D. D., Bishop of Pittsburg, has issued a Pastoral Letter, from which we quote so much as relates to the Encyclical Letter of his Holiness the Pope, as follows:

But our Holy Father, venerable and beloved brethren, does not censure nor condemn by any means religious toleration, which is the effect of that true charity, which, as St. Paul says, "beareth all things, endureth all things."—1st Cor. xiii, 7. He does not condemn that religious toleration by which persons living together under the same government, and in the same community, and professing different creeds, are, nevertheless, united in the bonds of charity and peace. He leaves every one to enjoy the peaceable practice of his religion without molestation or hindrance, either from individuals or civil authority. The Pope does not condemn such religious toleration; on the contrary, the Roman See has been more liberal and indulgent in that sense than any other civilized government. When the Jews were persecuted in many parts of Europe, they lived unmolested in the very city of Rome. And even at the present time, though none of the Pope's temporal subjects are Protestants, yet his government has allowed a Protestant church to be built in Rome (*a la porta del popolo*) for the benefit of Protestant travelers, where they may enjoy to their heart's content the free exercise of their religion. A place of interment has also been granted to them. where their dead can be buried according to the rites and ceremonies of their own religion.

"Catholic nations have, in truth, been far more tolerant than non-Catholic nations. Compare Catholic France with Protestant England; though in France the Protestants are a small minority, yet they have equal rights and equal privileges with their Catholic fellow-citizens. How different is it in England, though catholics are far more numerous in the United Kingdom than Protestants are in France.—Again, compare Catholic Austria with her non-Catholic subjects; how cruel, how brutal is Russia to the now bleeding Catholic Poles; alas, for the subjects of the autocrat! Compare the liberal spirit displayed by Catholic Belgium, in accepting for its King the Protestant Leopold with the fanaticism and persecution of Protestant Sweden. By no means venerable and beloved brethren, does the Pope condemn the religious toleration of freedom of concience which we enjoy in America. Far from it; he is rather satisfied with the present religious state of affairs, what could not be otherwise under the peculiar circumstances of our country. Protestants and Catholics lived together, fought together, mingled their blood and died together for American Independence, which was ultimately obtained by the combined efforts of all. When the United States became an independent nation, what course more wise, more prudent, could our

fathers, the framers of our Constitution, adopt than that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, and that equal religious rights and privileges be granted to all those who fought and died for American Nationality. No, no. The Pope does not condemn any just, fair and reasonable toleration or freedom of worship. He condemns, and justly condemns, the rights of all kinds of liberty to be restained by law, for real liberty; it is license and anarchy. We are the most free people in the world, yet we condemn political license and civil anarchy; and the Pope condemns what is far worse, license in worship and anarchy in religion."

Ths above passage of Bishop Dornence's Pastoral to the clergy of his diocese, was published in the *Pittsburgh Commercial* of June 1. It is difficult to know in what spirit to accept such statements as are contained in this pastoral. So flagrant an outrage upon truth, and equally upon the enlightened Catholic and Protestant mind of this land, is indeed difficult to imagine, and we are bold to say, has rarely been attempted. The system of reasoning, the method of casuistry, by which the Bishop,—whom we are not to suppose a man unconscious of the awful sacredness of truth, and of a decent respect of public opinoin,—can justify himself in making these monstrous declarations, we, for our part, schooled only in the laws of truth and conscience which the Bible and the common laws of morality teach,—are entire strangers to. There lives not a Catholic prelate, or any other Catholic intelligent in the history of his church, but that knows that "religious toleration," and "freedom of conscience," which are the same, have never, at any period, past or present, been accepted in theory or practice by the supreme authority of his church, but on the contrary, as a great world wide fact of history, they have ever been denounced and anathematized by it. From the remotest history of the dominant power of Rome, to this day and this hour in which we write, religious liberty or toleration has ever been denounced by the Pope as a "pestilential error; and this denunciation has been fearfully illustrated *in every land* where Catholicism was, or is, supreme. Name the exception to this *universal* statement, Reverend Bishop, if you can, and confound us! Is it Rome?—Let the records terrible as they are, of the Papal Inquisition attest!—Let the fact that in our own day travellers have been stripped of their Bibles and Testaments attest! Let the host of countless martyrs attest! Is it the rest of Italy? Is it Naples, Florence, Piedmont? The past and the present cry with one voice, No! religious freedom has never been known there. Is it Spain? The names of religious martyrs—and we could give them, are many and illustrious. Within the past two years the noble Matamoros and others, have been tried and severely punished and are now in exile, for their faith. Their case, as that of Francsco and Rosa Madiai in Mlorence, has attracted the attention of the

world, and governments have interfered in their behalf, and all that these were able to obtain for the victims of Catholic *intolerance*, was the mercy of exile! We remember, a few yers since, reading a noble plea by prominent, enlightened members of the Spanish Cortes *in behalf of religious toleration*, but which was without avail. If Catholic governments are the most tolerant, what of the *autos da fe* of the Spanish Peninsula, and even in the Portuguese possessions in East India? And is not the King of Spain "His Most Catholic Majesty?" Shall we appeal to Germany in the days of the unlimited control of Catholicism there? The name of her ante-Reformation martyrs is legion! Who burned Huss and Jerome? and who sought to crush Luther? Is this forgotten?—Again, what was the cause of the thirty Years' War, one of the most desolating in history?—Was it not this very thing, for which the Bishop says the Catholic governments are so famed,—religious tolerance? Was it not for the very purpose of securing to Protestants in Catholic governments freedom and equal rights? Who does not know this? Shall we appeal to France?—That land is the most blood-stained of all by the cruel, persecuting, intolerance of Catholicism! The victims of Romish intolerance there are numbered by hundreds of thousands. Up to the days of the French revolution, excepting the few years of the reign of Henry IV, religious freedom was a thing unknown in that land. Does the Bishop of Pittsburg really *not* know what was the great maxim of Louis XIV?—It was simply "one faith alone shall be allowed for Frenchmen!" Does he not know that in the lifetime, perhaps, of men yet living, Frenchmen were yet in chains on the galleys on the Mediterranean coast,—chained there for forty years,—for their faith only? Does he really *not* know that thousands of children, infants often, were torn from the embrace of frantic parents,—Protestants, Huguenots,—to be kept forever from them, to be brought up in the 'true faith'? Does he really not know this? And is he altogether ignorant of the history of English persecutions? Does he know nothing of the fires of Smithfield;—of the martyrdom of Latimer, Ridley, Rogers, Cranmer, Tyndal, and of countless more? And if he he is not ignorant of all these things,—known and read of all men,—how can he say what he has said in this pastoral, and not blush before his own clergy and the world, and tremble before God?

Perhaps it will be profitable to refresh the Bishop's memory, as it seems to be frail on these points, as to some of the later facts of history on this subject. He refers us to France. Does he wish to falsify history? Whence dates, and whence came, toleration in that land? It dates from the French Revolution of last century, and sprang from the bosom of that up-rising, and was denounced by Rome

and its magnates. The French people wrenched it from the hands of a Catholic government, *that never would have yielded it to them;* and in doing this the combined power of the clergy, especially the higher, was against them. It was a thorough anti-Bourbon, anti-clerical, anti-Romish movement. This freedom once gained, it never could be wrested from the people again; yet a constant effort has been made, —and is made this day in France,—to curtail the privileges of Protestants. A number of cases have come up since the present Emperor's rule, in which Catholic influence has been persecuting Protesants in France. The present King of Italy has also favored religious freedom to some extent. Have the Pope and the Catholic clergy been with him in this respect, or have they not to this hour fiercely opposed him? What says the Bishop to this question? Is not the King now under a papal interdict and threat of excommunication? There is a new, improvised empire, right alongside of us,—we mean Mexico, in which Maximilian has published a decree, small enough, of toleration. What do the Pope and the prelates of Mexico say to this?—Need I quote the language to Bishop Dornence? *The Pope has rebuked Maximilian for this very act, and the Bishops have remonstrated and demanded a revocation of this act of tolerance.* This is history alongside of us in 1865. If in Catholic countries there is any religious freedom at all, anywhere,—and rare enough, and little enough it is,—it is in spite of Catholic influence, that is, in spite of the Pope and his ecclesiastical host.

But "the Holy Father does not condemn religious toleration."—This is amazing, truly. How an American Catholic Bishop can say this, is beyond our conception, when the Papal Encyclical of last year with its syllabus, is so monstrous an attack on all modern, Christian ideas of freedom and toleration, that Catholic monarchs have actually forbidden its publication, as in France and Italy!—when even, in many cases, Catholic prelates have not dared to defend it. It was looked upon as a matter of astonishment that Bishop McCloskey of New York, should publicly avow his consent to it. Some of the other Catholic Bishops of our country dared not do it, and got over the scandal, by telling us that the Encyclical did not apply to this country. This is not true of course, as an Encyclical in its very address and intent, is "to all Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops and Bishops." This Encyclical has excited a scandal all over the Christian world for its mediæval, blind and insane assault upon all free thought. It is the very climax of intolerance. In the "syllabus" attached to it, it enumerates specifically all that Romanism hates and disavows and opposes, in our day of free thought and speech:—religious, and almost every other kind of toleration, is prominent in this

list of anathemas. In this *Pio Nono* is not peculiar, however. His predecessor, Gregory XVI, in his Encyclical of 1832, says: "From that polluted fountain of indifference flows that absurd and erroneous doctrine, or rather raving, in favor and defense of 'liberty of conscience'; for which most pestilential error, the course is opened by that entire and wild system of liberty of opinion, which is everywhere attempting the overthrow of religious and civil institutions; and which the unblushing impudence of some has held forth as an advantage." So says the Pope. And now Bishop Dornence tells us the Pope is in favor of religious toleration! What are we to understand by this! Or does his Grace make a difference between 'liberty of conscience' and 'religious toleration'? If 'liberty of conscience' is to be denied, what is 'religious toleration' worth? Is not the latter based on the former; and is not the former greater than, and does it not embrace, the latter?

As we are at pains to enlighten the Bishop, as he could not possibly have said what he said with a good knowledge of history, we will call more particularly to his mind a *late* fact in the history of the intolerance of Catholic countries, referred to above,—that of the Madiai, husband and wife, tried and condemned to severe penalties at Florence, Nov., 1851. We know Catholics meet our allegations by denying our statement of facts. We give the leading charges and the decision in this case, from the official documents before us in the original Italian. From these we shall see whether this condemnation was a political or religious one.

"1. It results that Francesco and Rosa Madiai, husband and wife, born and raised in Catholicism, separated themselves from it some five years since, to embrace the religion called by them *Evangelical*, or *of the pure Gospel*; that since that period, and especially in the course of the year 1851, they have permitted in their homes assemblies of exercise and instruction in the aforesaid faith; and these assemblies, as declared by those who attended, were held at first under the direction of a foreign teacher, and were composed of more than thirty persons, for the most part Tuscans, some Catholics, and others already opposed to Catholicism, and belonging to the class of artisans; and to these were delivered Bibles translated into Italian and prohibited by the Catholic church, as well as various other small religious works containing errors condemned by the said church, to be distributed even outside of these assemblies to adepts divided in decuries, forming a society which they called *Fratellanza*—Brotherhood," &c., &c. Then it charges them formally, as consequence, with *Impiety*, &c., &c. The condemnation is as follows:

"Francesco Madiai and Rosa his wife, are condemned, the first to

56 months of confinement in the house of hard labor at Volterra; and the second to 45 months imprisonment in the Ergastolo. And they are condemned to pay the expenses of the trial and judgment, amounting to 200 livres."

"Compare Catholic countries with Protestant," says the Bishop. We accept the challenge and give a case, and ask in what Protestant country under heaven could such an event as the above have happened in the year 1851?

But the Pope has allowed a Protestant church to be erected and used at Rome, "where *Protestants* can worship to their heart's content"! Ah, your Reverence, this is cunning, but very uncandid.—Will you have the goodness to tell the people of your Diocese how long since, or rather, how lately, this *small* chapel was allowed to be established, and what long and hard and *powerful* work and pleading was necessary, from high places, to wrest this privilege from His Holiness, the Pope. We know the facts in the case. For a very long time,—indeed until a very recent period,—Protestant ambassadors were simply, as a favor, allowed to have their religious services *in their houses.* It was an equally hard struggle to get a cemetery. It is not true that Protestants can exercise their religion at Rome to their hearts' content. That Protestant's heart must be content with very little if he can be satisfied with the privileges granted at Rome! Now compare Rome in this respect with the freedom allowed to Catholics in the great centers of Protestantism—Geneva, Berlin, London, &c. As to Belgium, will the Bishop have the kindness to tell the whole story about king Leopold and the incessant trouble created there by the Catholic clergy and the Jesuits against free ideas, and all the elements of a free constitution? We trow *not.*

It would be a waste of time to quote from all the Catholic sources of authority at our command, to show that Catholicism is intolerant, even to punishment with death. We conclude with some passages from an American Catholic source,—passages that are trenchant and honestly Catholic, that have the real Popish ring in them. They are from *The Shepherd of the Valley*, a Catholic paper published at St. Louis, and of the date of April 10th, 1852. We select these paragraphs because they are of our country, of a late date, and touch with a special vigor on the very question before us, and furnish the best and boldest refutation of Bishop Dornence's Pastoral. The heading of the artice is, "Religious Freedom." The article is a long one, and all of like tenor; and we are constrained to limit ourselves to a few quotations. We wish every Protestant could read the whole.—This Catholic paper had been rebuked by others in this country for imprudence in speaking out too plainly. The editor proceeds:

"The Church, we admit, is of necessity intolerant; that is, she does everything in her power to check, as effectually as circumstances will permit, the progress of crime and error. Her intolerance follows necessarily from her claim of infallibility; she alone has the right to be intolerant."

"We have said that we are not advocates of religious freedom, and we repeat we are not. The liberty to believe contrary to the teachings of the Church, is the liberty to believe a lie; the liberty to think otherwise than she permits, is the liberty to abuse the mind and pollute the imagination; from such liberty may we and those we love at all times be preserved."

"The Catholic who says the Church is not intolerant, belies the Sacred Spouse of Christ; the Christian who professes to be tolerant himself, is dishonest, or ill-instructed, or both."

"If the Catholics ever gain—which they surely will do, though at a distant day—an immense numerical superiority, religious freedom in this country is at an end. So say our enemies. So we believe.—But in what sense do we blieve it? In what sense are we the advocates of religious intolerance? In the sense in which the enemies of the Church understand the word? By no means. We simply mean that a Christian people will not consider the ridicule of Christianity, the denial of its fundamental truths, of the immortality of the soul and the existence of God, the overthrow of all religion and morality, matters beneath their notice and condemnation; that the foundation will be laid for a legislation which shall restrain the propagation of certain doctrines; that men will no longer be permitted to attack dogmas with which morality is inseparably connected. * * * We avow it as our intimate conviction that religious liberty, as at present understood, is inconsistent with the prevalence of infidelity itself."

"Well, then, is this doctrine of toleration a Christian doctrine, or is it not? does it come from heaven or hell, from God or the devil? do we see any thing of it in the Bible, in the Fathers, in the actions or writings of the saints, in the treatises of the doctors of the Church? was it heard of before the birth of Protestantism? was it not condemned by the Council of Constance, and repeatedly by the Supreme Pontiffs? is it any thing more than a convenient theory, got up that Catholics living among Protestants may meet with less ill-will? are not the French Philosophers and their disciples its most zealous advocates; is not Gibbon full of it; has it ever had any thing more than a theoretical existence, except where it has been practically impossible to carry into active operation the principle which it condemns? was St. Thomas right when he said that 'it is a much worse thing to corrupt the faith, by which life is given to the soul, than to falsify money, which is an assistance to the temporal life?' did he reason correctly from these premises when he argued that temporal princes might justly punish convicted heretics? Have we stated any thing rash, erroneous, offensive to pious ears, or savoring of heresy, in the extract given above; is our opinion, as to the consequences of the spread of Christianity in this country, improbable; may we not expect the Church and Christian Rulers to act again as they have acted; is it not our boast that the Church never changes, and is not her history an open book, which all may read, which we cannot close if we

would, and of which we are accustomed to say that we have no cause to be ashamed?"

"We will say, however, that we are not in favor of roasting heretics, and that, if this sort of work is to be revived,—though in our miserable times it is quite impossible, since men have no belief which they care to propagate, or for which they dare endure,—if persecution is to be renewed, we should rather be its victims than its agents; but we are not, therefore, going to deny the facts of history, or to blame the saints of GOD, and the doctors and pastors of the Church, for what they have done and sanctioned. We say that the temporal punishment of heresy is a mere question of expediency; that Protestants do not persecute us here, simply because they have not the power; and that where we abstain from persecuting them, they are well aware that it is merely because we cannot do so, or think that, by doing so, we should injure the cause that we wish to serve. We are all intolerant,—all of us who believe."

"For our own part, we love consistency, and without pretending to be a very acute logician, we have a sufficient horror of being inconsequent. We like to see men carry their principles to their last results; it shows that they have confidence in them, and that they are honest in a certain sense."

"Civil toleration, however, is right enough when the times demand it, and such is certainly the case with us Americans, *here* and *now*."

"Our enemies will not believe that we are better than our Church, and,—for her,—her history is before them. They know what she sanctioned during the middle ages, what she did then, and does now where she can; they know, too, what they would do, were they in power; they judge us by themselves, They can reason besides, and when we say *two and two*, they will add *make four*, whatever we can do to stop them. Heresy is a mortal sin, kills the soul, sends the entire man, body and soul, to hell; it is, besides, a contagious disease, and affects the interest of unborn millions. Christian kings, believing this, will crush it in the shell. Christian States, knowing this, will drive it from their bodies when they can. Protestants are not fools; it is not well to make them think that we are. Let them hate us if they will, but let us compel them to respect us too.

"We like to have the good will of Protestants, when we can get it honestly; but we have faith, and we prefer the good will of the Saints to theirs. We will not, in thought, or word, blaspheme St. ALPHONSUS and St. IGNATIUS, St. THOMAS and St. DOMINIC, St. JOHN and St. PAUL, into whose society we hope one day to be mercifully received, not for our merits, but through their prayers and the grace of their Lord and ours."

This certainly is plain talk—for once the true, genuine Catholic, started, goaded out of, all disguise. Let the reader especially mark, in one of the above quotations, the very significant "HERE and NOW"; this is the whole mystery out. '*Here*' we are tolerant because we cannot help it, and only for that reason; but nowhere else where we can prevent it. '*Now*' we are inoffensive, but not when we get the power, and 'rule,' as we some day certainly shall!

We only add one word more. What is to be hoped of the free press of this country, when a paper like the *Commercial* will publish such a passage, out of complaisance, we presume, to the Bishop and the Catholics, of which it knows every word is false. Are these the reliable teachers of the public mind? If the 'Commercial' has succeeded,—which is quite probable,—in teaching any of its readers that Catholicism is in favor of religious freedom and toleration, it has committed a grievous sin against history and free institutions.

C. L. L.

LETTER FROM BRO. H. T. ANDERSON.

HARRODSBURG, KY., June 2, 1865.

DEAR BRO. LOOS:—I have read your review of my translation, found in the last No. of the Harbinger. With the *spirit* of your review, I am truly pleased. Permit me to notice the few places to which you object. In Luke xxii. 64, also in Matt. xxvi. 68, and Mark xiv. 65, I have used the words, "give a response." The Greek verb is προφητευσον in each instance. The English verb "prophesy" would not express the sense.—We want words that will be adapted to the occasion, and to the persons who spoke. Jesus was condemned by the Sanhedrim, according to Matt., before the soldiers began to treat him thus impiously. To put words into the mouth of these men that indicated any respect, would be out of place. The Pharisees had charged him with casting out demons by Beelzebub, the prince of demons. He was not, when the soldiers uttered these words, a prophet in their estimation. He was a wonder-worker—nothing more—instigated by the devil or a demon. They used the word προφητευσον, but in a bad sense. The circumstances of the case seem to me to require the words I have used, "Give a response." So also Dr. Robinson. Green gives as the meaning of προφητευσον our word *divine*. The words are used in mockery: and "Give a response" seem to me to fill the requirements of the occasion. Our word *declare* is too solemn a word for the occasion.

2. You next object to the word "Tabernacled," John i. 14. I made use of this word to express the thought of the Greek εσκηνωσεν. The flesh was the temporary habitation of the Word. The flesh was, then, the σκηνη, tent, or tabernacle of the Logos. To the same point the apostle Paul says, II Cor. v. 1, "If our earthly house του σκηνους, which is but a tent," &c. There is, then, a double idea in this word: 1, that of a tent as a temporary habitation; 2, that of a tabernacle in which God's glory was manifested, as in the tabernacle erected by Moses. I think the word is most expressive; and no other can be used in its stead.—Our word "dwelt" looks too much to permanency or habitation. Had

the apostle used the word μενω, we should not have the fine thoughts given us by the verb σκηνοω.

3. The term *true*, John v. 31, would convey an untrue idea. For one person can certainly testify truly. As the law required the testimony of two or three witnesses, that of one witness was not regarded as "worthy of credit." These strong Hebraisms, when they do not convey a correct idea, should be translated into suitable English. Such is my judgment.

4. The words, "They found in him occasion for offense," Matt. xiii. 57, are, in my judgment, true to the original. The words of the C. V., "They were offended in him," are not in accordance with the spirit of of the New Testament. To be offended in one, or at one, and, to find an occasion for offense, are not the same in idea. The one expression implies that the offense may have a cause. The other implies, that offense is taken without a just cause. This is in accordance with that Scripture which says, "They hated me without a cause."

5. The word *fornication* and its cognates look too much to the term *fornix*. The idea is a special one. That conveyed by *lewdness, lewd actions*, is a general one—all unchaste conduct of the sexes, one towards the other.

6. The term *homage* is the only one known to me by which I can express the idea contained in the word προσκυνεω. "To do homage," is to bow reverently before one, as a king, or superior. Our word *worship* is used in reference to God only.

I shall read with care whatever you may be pleased to say, and send you my reasons for making use of such words as are found in my translation. I am pledged to nothing but the truth.

Yours very truly, H. T. Anderson.

P. S. I may be permitted to say, that to make a translation such as will please all, is impossible. The education, habits of thought, and mental constitution of men are all different, and their judgment of what is fit and appropriate, will, consequently, differ. I have reasons for what I have done. But my reasons may not be satisfactory to others.—I find that the critics differ, both as it respects the text and the meaning of it. Still, I am willing to hear whatever may be said; and whenever any thing better than my own is proposed, I will accept it. H. T. A.

We commend the above letter to the careful attention of our readers, and trust they will compare and weigh well what is said on both sides of this very interesting question. We beg leave to say, however, that we do not intend to open a controversy by our criticism of Bro. Anderson's translation. We intend freely and fairly to commend and except against, in this translation and others, as our judg-

ment dictates; and the author, of course, must have free opportunity to explain and defend himself. A reviewer must be free. We are confident, as yet, of the correctness of our strictures, and believe that the mature decision of the people will sustain them in the end. Nothing in the above defense of the highly esteemed author has induced any change in our mind as to the points he touches upon. We may, however, at some time hereafter, in a general summing up, refer to some of these again. We feel quite willing, for the present, to leave the general question thus far with our readers. C. L. L.

TRADITIONS OF CYPRUS.

Dear Father:—Mother mentioned in one of her late letters that you were expecting a descriptive account of the popular traditions, *fetes*, and legends that form so prominent a part of the history of this Island, and without which the sketch I have given you in former letters would be altogether incomplete. I fear that in risking this narrative, however pleasing many of the fables of heathen mythology may be in connection with our insulary world, it will not elevate the descendants of the Paphian goddess in your good opinion; and I must beg you to allow me the privilege of a *private communication*.

You are aware that in the Greek monasteries, and even in some of the village churches in the East, on the days of the saints to whom they are dedicated, festivals or fairs are held, called by the Greeks of the present day, as indeed by their faithful old historian, Herodotus, *Panegyria*. Of those celebrated in Larnaca, the most important are the festivities at the church of St. George, near this place, characterized by drunkenness, trafficking, and general dissipation, and the festivals of the *Kataklysmos*—or the Deluge—which is the national *fete* of the Island, observed on the sea-shore, the day after the Greek Pentecost, in honor of Venus, who sprung from the froth of the sea (whence her name Aphrodite) either here or at Paphos, tradition not being *very definite* as to the reality!

This festival is not regarded as a religious one, though participated in by the Christians and the population of the Island generally; no mass is performed, nor are offerings made to any shrine whatever, nor is it observed in any other place except Cyprus. It is probably the remnant of some heathen festival in honor of Venus, the time-honored divinity of the Island; and this accounts no doubt for the festival being held on the sea-board, as well as in the sea, and for its being known under the name of the "Deluge." The Babylonians and Assyrians had their mythology also respecting the nativity of Venus. They

believed that an egg of a prodigious size dropped down from heaven into the Euphrates, and that some doves settled upon it after it had been washed to the bank. In a short time this egg produced Venus, who was afterwards called the Syrian goddess—Astarte. At Hierapolis, in Syria, there was a magnificent temple dedicated to this goddess, and according to a law instituted by Deucalion in commemoration of the Deluge, people from all parts carried water to this temple thrice a year and poured it into an apartment which existed there, and which was believed to communicate with the sea. No vestige of this observance is to be found at present in Syria. I have often witnessed the observance of this festival here. Early in the morning the ceremony is commenced by throwing water promiscuously in the faces of the passers-by, as well as dipping one another into the sea, saying, "God be blessed!" Thousands come to pay their homage to the sea, to bathe in its waters, and *cross* themselves with its white foam.—The beach is crowded with donkeys, mules and camels, that have brought the inhabitants from every part of the Island. Here a company of Greeks may be seen with their long *tarbouches* (red caps), drinking *raki*, or whiskey and sweetened rose water, discussing and gesticulating most violently; thence the Turks, sipping coffee, raise with dignity their heads, covered with a white turban, and fill the atmosphere with the odors of the *narghelie* and *chibouk* (pipe); their wives, covered with a long, flowing white veil, from under which no smile can appear, move listlessly along the beach. The girls destined to be married are decorated with necklaces of gold coins, given them as their marriage dowry, and as a magnet to enchain some gay Adonis. The children feast on cakes dipped in the honey of the *carous*, or locust pod, fruits and sweetmeats, and evidently enjoy it as a great gala-day In the harbor gay flags are fluttering, and wild Greek dances and music form a part of the revelry and dissipation until a late hour in the night, when the crowd disperses.

I mentioned in one of my letters that a statue of Venus of exquisite workmanship and beauty had lately been exhumed near this place. I have succeeded in securing a fine photograph of it, which I hope soon to place in your hands. The ruins of her temple, built upon the spot where the goddess landed when she was washed on shore by the gentle waves from which she sprung, may still be seen at Paphos, one of the oldest and most interesting sites in the Island. It is said to have been built by Cinyras, king of Assyria, as well as the temple of Venus which he dedicated to her, who had Adonis and others by Metherme, daughter of Pygmalion, king of Cyprus. Some say the founder was Paphos, son of Pygmalion by the statue which Venus animated, and thence the Island derived its name. "Illa Paphum gen-

urit, de quo tenet insula nomen."* This temple was thrown down by an earthquake, "rebuilt one thousand four hundred and ninety five years before the birth of Christ, and finally destroyed by St. Barnabas in the 4th year of the Christian era." Its destruction is fixed more accurately in the 4th century by an earthquake. It was upon this occasion, say they, that St. Helena restored water to the Island by virtue of the wood of the Savior's Cross, which she had discovered in Jerusalem, and which fixed the present traditional site of the "Church of the Holy Sepulcher." She gave one half to the priests of Jerusalem, and brought the other half along with her in her homeward voyage, scattering its miraculous and sanctifying influences East and West. Accordingly an infinite number of miracles were performed by this hallowed wood, and tradition says that had she not thrown one of the nails of it (which are called passion nails) into the sea, when overtaken by a terrible storm in Satalia Bay, her Imperial Majesty would have visited the nether abodes of Neptune, instead of those of Jupiter on Mt. Olympus, where she built a fine chapel on the ruins of the "cloud gatherer's" temple—but the holy nail bore down the waves, smoothed the surface of the sea, and procured her a safe landing.—Near the ruins of *old* Paphos is the celebrated spring called the "fountain of love." Tradition is not at fault for once in fixing this as the spot where Elymas the sorcerer was struck blind, and Sergius Paulus the Proconsul was converted by Paul. The country around Paphos is very fertile, and rich in beautiful gardens, and it is no doubt owing to the variety and beauty of the fruit trees of Cyprus, that fable has fixed here, in the middle of the field of Tamassus, the tree from which Venus gathered the three apples of gold, the charm of which permitted Hippomenes to conquer and possess the beautiful Atalanta.

Amongst the most singular and prevailing superstitions in the Island, is that of the evil eye. *A single regard*, they say, is sufficient to kill you, your child or wife, your horse or donkey, or to bring upon you the destruction of your harvests, or fire your dwelling. Many unfortunate persons, suspected of having this power of the evil eye, have been most inhumanly treated. Inasmuch as it is only the first look—"*coup d'œil*"—that is believed to be dangerous, the Eastern people not unfrequently when approaching you, turn away the head. They are careful also to place at the entrance of their dwellings frightful objects, to attract the sight and attention. It is on this account that many of the houses and gardens are disfigured by skulls of camels, cows and horses, placed as prominent objects of observation. Near this place is also shown the sepulcher of Mohammed's nurse, which is held in high veneration by the Turks; but in what

* Ovid.

manner the venerated lady was transported from Arabia, we are not told.

At Amathus it is said that St. John the almoner, son of Epiphranius, governor of Cyprus, first saw the light in this place. In the beginning of the 7th century, he was made patriarch of Egypt, but he had so strong an attachment to his native spot that he chose to die in Amathus, and so grateful were the dead for this instance of his regard, that when he resigned his soul to heaven and his body to the earth, two bishops who had been for some time in peaceable possession of a magnificent tomb, rose up at his approach, and made way for his more sanctified body. The most extravagant traditions are to be found in connection with the convents and monasteries, which live upon the ignorance and credulity of the people, but the limits of my letter will only permit me to mention a few of these. One of the largest and most prominent in the Island, is that dedicated to St. Barnabas. During the Byzantine reign in this Island, when Leo occupied the throne of Constantinople, they say that a peasant was directed in a dream to a certain spot, where he was assured he would find a relic of inestimable value. He at once repaired to the place and found the body of St. Barnabas intact and undecayed, and the gospel of Matthew lying upon his bosom, written by the hand of Barnabas his pupil. The peasant brought the sacred relics to the archbishop of Cyprus, who transmitted them to the Emperor, and as a recompense it was ordained by royal decree that the church of Cyprus be forever independent, and its archbishop have the privilege of signing his name in royal ink, which is practiced to this day. I have received a number of communications from "*his beatitude*," since my appointment as Russian Consul, all of which are signed in red ink. The church of "St. Lazarus" in this place is also regarded with great veneration, and annually on his particular feast day, his resurrection is enacted by representation, accompanied with the most solemn ceremonies; a young man feigning to die, while a chant is being sung, in which the *life-giving* words of our Savior are repeated—when he springs forth before the anxious multitude to their evident satisfaction!! They say that the apostle Paul appointed him elder of the church during his visit to Cyprus, and that he lived thirty years after his resurrection. His body was carried to Constantinople by command of Leo, and the large church in this place built by his order. My Greek professor informed me that it was the belief here that he never laughed, because he had seen the vanities of this world and the sufferings of the nether world. The monastery in most repute, however, is that of "*Chico*," or the *cuckoo*, containing one of the three prototype paintings of the Virgin Mary, believed to have been executed by the apostle Luke. This image was at first owned by the Em-

peror Alexis; one of the others is in Moscow, and one in Athens — A certain monk was called to the palace, to cure by incantation the daughter of the Emperor, who suffered from convulsions. The monk improved the opportunity to remove the image, *the most beautiful and* EXACT of all!!! He immediately set sail in a small ship, to go wherever the winds might waft him. By supernatural power, he was carried to Cyprus, where he landed with the image of the Virgin pressed to his bosom. The Virgin then ordered him to build her a convent on the spot where he should first hear the notes of the cuckoo. He had not proceeded far into the northern part of the Island, when his ears were saluted by this "bird of love," and the convent accordingly was located in one of the most picturesque and beautiful portions of the Island. It is richly endowed, supporting some two hundred monks, and has frequently been an object of pillage and devastation by the Turks. It is under the immediate patronage of the nobility of Russia, more particularly of the ladies, who have great faith in its miraculous influences, and visit it as a sacred idol!!!

Amongst the most peculiar customs of the Island, is one which may recommend itself for general observance, even in *more civilized countries.* I mention it for the public good. When a visitor stays too long, and wearies you with his conversation, they put large pieces of salt in his chair, and he leaves forthwith, as if by charm. Is not this a discovery worth communicating? A malediction also is accompanied with salt, sometimes with barley. As in ancient Greece an infant was covered over with a cloth having the head of Medusa imprinted on it, as in this manner they hoped to transfer it to the shield of Minerva and acquire her protection and qualities, so the modern Greeks take an article of clothing, on the birth of a child, belonging to the most distinguished and best of its relatives, burn a hole in the center of it, and put it on the neck of the child, where it remains a few days—the fortunate child being thus endowed with the good qualities of the relative.

But I fear that I should entirely exhaust your patience, and consum- your valuable time, were I to enlarge on this budget of fables, tradi tions, "*et id omne genus*," so prolific in this part of the world; so that I shall bring my pen to a stop for the present.———Ever your affectionate son, J. JUDSON BARCLAY.

LARNACA, Island of Cyprus, March, 1865.

"Every kind of beasts, and of birds, and of serpents, and things in the sea, is tamed, and hath been tamed of mankind. But the tongue can no man tame; it is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison."—*James.*

THE CONFESSION.

Bro. McGarvey gives what he conceives to be an improvement on my version of Heb. xiii. 15—"Through him, therefore, let us continually offer the sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips *confessing* to his name."

Bro. McGarvey did not notice, perhaps, the structure of the Greek in this place. The participle here takes the dative, and the sense no longer remains exactly the same. We do not say *confess to. Confessing to his name* is not good English; nor will the Greek admit the thought. To confess a good confession, to confess Jesus Christ, to confess that he is Lord, to confess sins, to confess the truth, to confess *en tini*—in behalf of one—that is, to confess him, is appropriate and right; but to confess *to* one, or *to* one's name, is not English.—Hence, when the verb *homologeoo* takes a dative, we must understand a Hebraism which requires us to render as I have done—*to give thanks.* The idea is *to acknowledge to our* benefits, and hence, to give thanks. This is the usage in the Septuagint. See Psalm 75. 2, Sept. 74. 2, where the verb *exomologeoo* occurs; also Matt. xi. 25. The same verb occurs Luke x. 21. In each instance to give thanks—but with the dative. In Matt. 6. the same verb occurs, but with accusative; confessing their sins. So Mark i. 5, same form; also Acts xix. 18, same. James v. 18, it takes the accusative and dative. To confess sins *to* one is legitimate. The instance (Heb. xiii. 15,) with the dative reequires the translation I have given.

Not only does the usage, by Hebraism, require the translation I have given; the connection also requires it: for the offering of the sacrifice of praise is explained by the second clause of the sentence—"That is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name." The word "our" is necessary to answer to the "us" just above. See Hosea xiv. 2. What, then, is the sacrifice of praise? It is the fruit of—not flocks, nor the ground, but—our lips giving thanks to his name. "Offer to God thanksgiving." Ps. l. 14. I am well sustained in my version of this passage.

In II Cor. ix. 13, to introduce the term *confession* would indeed be difficult. When so much difficulty attends its introduction, to introduce it would justify a critic in saying that the text is strained. The passages quoted by Bro. McGarvey establish for the *confession* all that is needed. Now, the terms *homologeoo* and *exomologeoo* are used in different senses, in the New Testament, as already shown. But let us look a little further. In Matt. xiv. 7, *homologeoo* evidently has the meaning *to promise.* Herod promised with an oath. In Acts vii. 17,

it is translated *made*. "As the time of the promise which God made"—*homologeesen*—better than "the promise which God promised." In Acts xxiii. 8, it is translated by the word *acknowledge*: "But the Pharisees acknowledge both." In Titus i. 16, by the word *profess*: "They *profess* that they know God."

With this usage before us, there is no difficulty in the place under consideration. The Corinthians had acknowledged Christ. Now the Hebrew brethren in Judea glorified God for this acknowledged subjection—a proof of which acknowledged subjection was given in the liberal contribution made by the Gentiles for their wants.

Again: the *eis to euaggelion* immediately following, must depend on *hupotagee*; and to bring intc the translation the term *confession* would be impossible, without laying myself open to the charge of straining the text. Bro. McGarvey's translation is liable to a very grave objection. Its meaning is not at all clear. "They glorify God for the subjection, which your confession yields, to the gospel of Christ." I am not able to determine the relation of the clause "to the gospel of Christ." Does it limit the term "subjection," or the verb "yields." This obscurity is fatal to the translation. My translation—"They glorify God for your acknowledged subjection to the gospel of Christ," is perfectly intelligible: and it involves all that Bro. McGarvey would ask—that the Corinthians had acknowledged Christ; or, if he prefers, had confessed him. For if the fact be established that each one did, at his immersion, confess Christ, then, beyond doubt the Corinthians did so.

I confess, I think that a cause is weakened, rather than strengthened, by straining a text in proof of it. H. T. Anderson.

Harrodsburg, Ky., June 19th, 1865.

SCRIPTURE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.*

1. Please give your views of the 23d chapter of Matthew, 34, 35, and 36th verses—why the blood of Abel and the righteous that suffered was required of the Jews, who were not in existence for upwards of 2,000 years from the death of Abel?

Ans.—To understand this awful declaration, we must consider particularly the facts announced in the 34th and 35th verses. "Wherefore, behold, I send you prophets and wise men and scribes; and some of them you will kill and crucify; and some of them you will scourge in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city, that upon

* These questions are from the thoughtful mind of our venerable brother A. Rice, of Missouri.

you may come all the righteous blood which has been shed upon the earth, from the blood of Abel the just to the blood of Zachariah, the son of Barachiah, whom you slew between the temple and the altar."

The expression, "upon you may come the blood," &c, must be understood to mean *upon you may fall the guilt and the punishment*. The difficulty presented in the query is "How to justify the sentence, which requires the Jews in the days of our Savior to suffer punishment for the blood of Abel and others shed before they were born."

In the first place, we remark that every generation inherits the fortunes of their ancestors. If they take the good, they also get the evil. "If the fathers have eaten sour grapes, the teeth of the children will be on edge." In the providence of God, nations have a life time, just as individuals. There is a time of infancy, of youth, of manhood, and of old age. They grow in prosperity and power, and they grow also in sin and iniquity. But there comes a time when their cup is full, and then the hand of divine judgment falls upon them, and the last generation shares the final doom which is the result of the accumulated wickedness of all. This is the profound and righteous law of Providence. If every man lived to himself alone, and his actions had no bearing upon the general fortunes of the society of which he is a member, then special personal judgment would be an adequate vindication of the divine government; but the sin of one man frequently sets into motion influences that run through many ages; these accumulate as they go, and finally culminate in consequences that call down the exterminating judgments of the Most High upon the people who may be the last in the line of succession, and therefore the victims of the punishment which is deserved for it all. The sin has run through many generations; in each one it has been denounced, and yet by each it has been repeated, and handed down with accumulated strength and aggravation to that which succeeds, till at last the enormity is so great that God's forbearance will suffer it no longer, and He lets his punishment fall in vengeance for it all, upon the heads of those with whom at last he finds it nourished and cherished in its fullness and maturity.

Let us apply this great and evident principle of the divine government to the case which is before us. To do so intelligently, we must determine, In what consists the *guilt* of shedding the blood of these innocent ones from Abel to Zachariah? Was it simply the guilt of homicide? This indeed would have been a stain upon the national character for which they might have been justly held responsible, so long as it was justified by the living or allowed by them to pass unatoned for. But the guilt was greater than this—for the sin was more than homicide. These righteous victims to popular fury were proph-

ets,—they were men sent of God to testify to the people from Him. To reject them, therefore, was to reject God, who sent them. From generation to generation, in unbroken succession, these witnesses had been raised up to testify, and from generation to generation they had been rejected and cut down by the people. Each witness added to the strength of this testimony, and each rejection of the witness, therefore, was a correspondently greater sin. Finally, in the last days, prophets, &c., are again raised up to testify. They complete the long chain of witnesses from Abel down—and they too are crucified. But the generation that rejects them, rejects at the same time all the rest. Each degree of strength in the testimony has a correspondent degree of obligation to receive it; and a consequent guilt for its rejection. The fullness of the testimony creates a fullness of obligation to receive it, and a consequent fullness of guilt for rejecting it. But the mission of the Savior brought this fullness of the testimony, and the rejection of the Savior incurred this fullness of guilt. The punishment of all the righteous blood shed from Abel to Zachariah came, therefore, upon the Jews at this time, because they rejected the fullness of the testimony which had been sealed by the blood, not only of those who came to them personally, but of those also whose testimony had come to them through all preceding generations of God's forbearance, from Abel down.

2. Please give your views of the 12th chapter, 25th, 26th, 27th, and 28th verses of the Hebrews? Was it the literal or metaphorical earth and heavens alluded to? and whose voice shook the earth and will shake the heavens?

Ans.—The verses you refer to, read thus: "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused him that spoke on earth, much more shall not we escape if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven: whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this, And yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that may be shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain."

The voice that shook the earth at the giving of the law, was the voice of Him who, in the Old Testament Scriptures, was known as the Angel of the Covenant, the Angel of the Lord, the Angel of the Presence, the Angel, the Redeemer. Stephen the protomartyr is our authority for this answer. Speaking of Moses, he says (Acts 7. 38), "This is he that was in the church in the wilderness, with the angel which spake to him in the Mount Sinai, and with our fathers," &c.—Since the fall, God has never appeared to man save in the mediatorial

person of the Redeemer. Not only did he forbid man to form any image or likeness of Himself, but, save in the person of Him who should come in the flesh, to deliver and restore man to union and fellowship, He never at any time revealed himself sensibly to any man. When Moses besought Him *to show him His glory*, He answered, "Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me and live." (Ex. 33. 20.) Yet Moses was not left without constant and glorious manifestations of the divine presence through "the Angel of the Covenant," who, as the eternal *Logos*, or *Wisdom*, ever rejoiced in the habitable parts of the earth, and had his delights with the sons of men. (Prov. 8. 31.)

That it was the literal earth that was shaken, is clear from the sublime description given us of the scene in the 19th chapter of Exodus: "On the third day, in the morning, there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the Mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud, so that all the people that were in the camp trembled. And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God, and they stood at the nether part of the Mount. And Mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire; and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly." This view will perhaps meet with but litle dissent, so far as this first shaking by the voice is concerned. But the same voice is once again to shake, not only the earth, but also heaven; and many interpreters, confining this promise, in its application, to the first coming of Christ on the earth, and the establishment of his kingdom after his resurrection and glorious ascension, find it necessary to understand the earth and heaven in this latter case metaphorically, and explain them to mean the established order of things—political, moral, and religious—as it might be found at his first coming. The passage is doubtless a quotation from the prophet Haggai, and fully rendered, warrants us in taking a wider view of its meaning. Haggai not only mentions "the heavens and the earth, and the sea and the dry *land*," but also adds, "And I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come." Thus, by expressly and literally naming the *human* things along with the simply physical, he compels us to take them both literally, and to understand, that not only are the popular notions and institutions to be shaken and overthrown, but also the material universe itself, when in the fullness of his glorious work of redemption, he shall come to perfect and permanently establish his everlasting kingdom. This second shaking, therefore, is to be of the literal earth and heaven, and doubtless refers to the same scene which is so awfully described by Peter, when he says, "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief,

in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat: the earth also and the works that are therein, shall be burnt up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness; looking for and hasting the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens, being on fire, shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat.—Nevertheless we, according to the promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." (1 Pet. 3. 10–13.)

3. Once more, How often did Moses bring water out of the rock?

ANS.—We are told of but two occasions of this miracle. The first is recorded in Exodus 17, and took place in the second month of the first year of the Exodus, while Israel was encamped at Rephidim.—Here the Lord stood before Moses upon the rock Horeb, and Moses smote it.

The second occasion is narrated in the 20th chapter of Numbers. It took place in the first month of the 40th year of the Exodus, while the people abode in Kadesh, in the desert of Zin. On this occasion Moses smote the rock twice, and committed the sin for which the Lord refused to let him bring the congregation into the land of promise. This rock typified Christ, who, as Paul declares, followed them in their journeyings through the desert; "for they drank of that spiritual rock which went with them: and that rock was Christ." (1 Cor. 10. 4.) W. K. P.

"GREAT MISTAKES."

The following paragraph, under the above caption, appeared some time ago in the "*World's Crisis*," published in Boston, Mass.:

"It is a great mistake for a *pardoned* sinner to think he will be saved without obedience to Christ after his *conversion*."

The following questions were suggested to my mind on reading it:

1. Does it follow, because a person is converted, that he is also pardoned?

2. Can a converted person be pardoned without obedience to Christ? "WHAT SAITH THE SCRIPTURES?"

The above was forwarded to the above-named paper, but was not published, nor do I know of a paper any where in this region that would publish it; perhaps for the reason that the questions may not be worthy of notice; but thinking differently myself, I have ventured to submit the matter to your decision. THOMAS HOLMAN.

ANSWER.—These are certainly not only very important, but highly practical questions. If by conversion, we mean such a change in one's views and feelings as makes him acknowledge to himself that he is a sinner, and under obligation to devote himself and all that he has to the service of God, then to remain in disobedience is a sin of the most unpardonable nature that we can conceive of. It is willful and deliberate rebellion against the felt and acknowledged grace of God, and comes as near to the unpardonable sin against the Holy Spirit, as any thing can do since the days of miracles.

Conversion may be contemplated in two aspects. First, That which we have just defined, and in which it precedes repentance; Second, That in which it comes after repentance. We have an example of the first use of this word in Jeremiah xxxi. 19. "Surely after that I was *turned* (converted) I *repented*." Here it signifies the correction of one's error, the change of his views and the restoring of him to his right mind—to a proper sense of his obligation and perception of his duties. The case is illustrated in the state of the prodigal son (Luke xv, 17). When he had spent his patrimony and was brought to extreme want, so that he fain would have satisfied his appetite with the husks that the swine fed on, and no man gave him relief,—then he came to his senses,—felt his folly and his sin, perceived his wretchedness and became convinced of the only remedy and relief, and *repented*. But suppose he had stopped here,—that after saying to himself, in the full conviction that it was right and necessary, "I will arise and go to my father, and say unto him, Father I have sinned against heaven and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants," he had still remained where he was, and refused to do what he acknowledged to be right and his duty both to himself and his father, would the joyful scene of their reunion have ever taken place, or the pardon and blessing of his father have ever been enjoyed by him.—Surely no one will affirm it. In this sense of the word conversion, surely it cannot be said, that a converted person is pardoned without obedience.

But in the second sense in which the scriptures contemplate conversion, it is equivalent to obedience itself. In this sense, of course nothing is called conversion that stops short of that act of obedience in which the person formally turns to God. The consummating and distinguishing act of conversion, in this second sense, is, in the style of the New Testament, Christian baptism, and no one is regarded as converted,—that is, as actually turned to God,—till he is baptized. This is evident from the declaration of Peter, Acts iii, 19, where he says, "Repent ye therefore and be converted, or turn to God." The com-

mand in this case required an act on the part of the penitent person, in which he would actually and formally change his position to his heavenly Father. The verb in the Greek is in the middle voice, and calls for an action that the party would himself perform. It is equivalent to *turn yourself to God.* We see, therefore, beloved Bro. Holman, that your question may be put in a still stranger form, and be made to ask, Can a person be converted, till he has been baptized?

In the full sense of the scriptures, then, we discover that in conversion, there are two parties,—God and man;—and two processes,—one of God, that changes the mind and heart; and the other of man,—that changes his relations, by an act of obedience, in harmony with his convictions;—and that without both of these, the sinner cannot be truly converted or brought into a state of pardon or favor with God. If any one chooses to limit the term—conversion—to the first of these processes, let him know that the party whom he leaves in this state is yet in his sins—under conviction, indeed, but without the evidence of pardon;—in a state in which God is showing him his sins and making him sensible of his duty, but only to aggravate his guilt, if he still, with his eyes enlightened, refuses to walk in the path of prescribed obedience. God does not pardon because he converts us, but because, having been converted by his Word and Spirit, we also convert ourselves, by humble and cheerful submission to that transforming act of obedience, which is prescribed in the gospel, and in which we pass from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son. W. K. P.

CHRONICLES.

Bro. Loos:—I have read with pleasure and profit your articles on "New Translations," and their bearing on the work recently given by Bro. Anderson. It will be seen, that the qualifications of a translator are and must be of a high order, to acquit himself well in what he undertakes. This is not only so in regard to the classics, but especially in reference to the Scriptures of truth. We have nine distinct persons represented in the New Testament, as writers. Jesus is the chief speaker. His discourses, parables and conversations are found in the four Testimonies, interspersed with introductory questions and answers; the cavils and complaints, charges, &c., of Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, rulers, and the people. In addition to which we have numerous speeches made by Peter, Paul, and other of the apostles, in the narrative given us by Luke. No one book extant furnishes us a greater variety of topics, introduced by so great a number of writers and speakers, as are found in the New Testament. To do justice to any one of them, would be a great achievement; but to master them

all, beyond the ability of any living man. Take the book of Matthew, written for the benefit of the Jews. The language and scenery of this book take us back to the times of the Messiah. It will require an extraordinary equipment, and a life-long study, to do justice to this work. It requires not only great familiarity with the language in which he wrote, but the *status* of that language at the times in which it was written, and among the people of the Jews in Palestine. He should be familiar with the laws and institutions, customs and usages, current in that day. The very *animus* of the nation he should study and know, and a thorough knowledge of the separate classes existing in the nation; and the whole translation should be redolent with the Messianic times, as given by Matthew. In short, it should be *Matthew's* testimony, seen and read of all men, with his own personality stamped upon it. The reader will be brought back to Judea and Galilee, and hold communion with the chief speaker, and all the persons introduced; the towns, villages, and cities in which he taught. The music of antiquity must fill the air and linger about the scenery of the things described. The olden times must re-appear, as true to life as human language can present them. To accomplish this, requires great learning and skill, —genius and talents of a high order. I suppose that the English language is sufficiently copious and flexible to give us a full and faithful translation of this book for all the purposes of instruction and salvation for which it was designed; and for that verisimilitude which gives such an indescribable charm to the works of genius in reproducing the past. But who is sufficient for these things? We think but very few.

But if the difficulties are so formidable in regard to Matthew, what shall we say in reference to Paul? He has written thirteen letters, addressed to churches among the Gentiles, and to individuals; and his masterly Epistle addressed to the Hebrew Christians—the latter differing in many respects in style, and language, and the topics discussed, from all the rest. Added to these, his discourses interspersed through the Acts of the Apostles, so unique and grand; so logical and eloquent. If the other writers of the New Testament appear as so many stars apart,—Paul is the Orion of the Heaven of Inspiration—a constellation—an entire system. What star-gazer has seen all that is found in this galaxy, and measured their distances and might? Who has caught all its light and shade; its brightness and nebular dimness? Paul, more than any other person, may be called "the "myriad-minded man," and it requires something of his own genius to comprehend and reproduce him. A translation of his works should be Pauline—not *Peterine* or *Johnine*. Whatever peculiarity is found in the original, should appear in the translation. Where he is luminous in the Greek, the same should appear in the English, with no excess and no diminution; and where he is obscure, no attempt should be made to enlighten what he has left us. There are some things too

mighty for human speech—even the speech of him who graduated in "the third heavens." Solomon tells us that "'tis the glory of God to conceal a thing." He has hidden from the eyes of men and angels more than he has revealed. It must be so, for the finite can bear no just proportions to the Infinite. Paul knew and felt this, and when he reached the outermost limit of human thought and human speech, he staggers and is overcome; but he fights manfully to the last.

I think it will be found that all translations more or less fail in reproducing Paul. It would be strange, indeed, if Anderson's should prove an exception. Our ideal of Paul seldom is seen in any translation. Look at the first chapter of Paul's letter to the Ephesian church, as given us by Bro. Anderson. It may be the best that can be produced, but if so, Paul is not the man I conceived him to be. I think he is clearer, greater, more compact, more choice in language than the rendering given. I take this for granted, simply because Paul wrote this letter. I do not speak authoritatively, but as one among large masses of the ordinary readers of the New Testament. Commence with the third verse, and read to the close of the fourteenth, and in the version he limps and loiters, creeps and saunters. There is a hobbling, lumbering gait in nearly the whole of the paragraph, that disappoints me. From the third to the tenth verse, inclusive, there are fourteen commas, which nearly exhausts all our breath to read; and to the end, but two semicolons and two colons to reach the grand period. To say the least of it, this is an enormous paragraph. It is perfectly Alexandrine in its lengthy chain. It may be Paul, but I think not; and yet I am not able to suggest any improvement. I propose, that Brethren Loos, Lard, McGarvey, and others, shall give us each a translation of this passage, and publish it in the Harbinger with Anderson's version of it, and let us compare them together. I ask this on my own account, and for Paul's sake. *

I do not wish to disparage Bro. Anderson's translation. I am not only pleased but delighted with it. It is on my table, and I daily read it. But it is not perfect. He can greatly improve it. If he lived to the age of Methusaleh, even with the present *status* of our language, it would undergo a thousand changes for the better. He is too much a scholar to shrink from criticism or be sensitive under it. He has thrown out his work to the public eye, to be seen and examined. We must look at it carefully, candidly and critically. None of his readers will be more jealous of his honor than his own brethren; and none more jealous of the rights of Paul and Peter and the other sacred writers, than they. He has made a call for ten thousand readers of a

* This is a good suggestion, and we hope none of the scholars named will decline to favor us with an effort. Our pages shall be gratefully given for the publication. W. K. P.

pocket edition. I hope that he may have half a million. It is incomparably better than the old version, and will be read with profit.—The greater the number of translations, the better. The poorest, even, cannot be dispensed with. We are not ready to adopt his work. He does not expect it.

It may be that no one man has sufficient genius, talent and learning to give a translation of all the books of the New Testament. They should be divided among many, and each part become a speciality—a life-study. No one man has the leisure—the time in three-score years and ten to accomplish such a Herculean task. It took Gray sixteen years to write and re-write his "Elegy on a church-yard." The poem is as nearly perfect as any human production known. His task was not so great as that of giving a translation of Paul to the church in Ephesus! JAMES CHALLEN.

Bro. Challen's letter furnishes much food for reflection. This great question of an acceptable and satisfactory translation of the Word of God, deserves to be thoroughly discussed and sifted; and the suggestions Bro. Challen makes are very important ones. The public mind must be well educated as to the true character of a good translation, or else men may very readily accept the false for the true, the defective for the perfect. The discussions now going on on this great topic we cannot but hail with joy, as working together for the true interests of the Word of God. Some of the points touched upon by Bro. C., we have reserved for a future article. C. L. L.

JERUSALEM MISSION.

We learn that our beloved brother J. T. Barclay, so long our missionary to Jerusalem, will soon return to the United States. He will be welcomed by many brethren, and his story of Jerusalem and her present people and prospects, will be heard with increasing interest. He has had intimations of a returning confidence in the Jerusalem Mission, and says, "I hail with peculiar emotions of joy the first indications of a revival of interest in behalf of foreign missions in general, and of the Jerusalem mission in particular." Should the mission be revived, he proposes, at his own expense, to "publish a small serial for circulation in the Western States and in Great Britain." He says,—"That the glorious cause for which we are contending should be permanently represented at the place of its origin, is due, I think, alike to the brotherhood and to the cause itself; and so far is my estimate of the importance of that locality, as a point from which the truth should radiate conspicuously, from having undergone any diminution, a more extended acquaintance with the subject but serves to confirm my appreciation of it more than ever."

We doubt not, that Bro. Barclay's personal experience, and his unalterable faith in this mission, as the work of his life, will, to a very great extent, revive the old interest which the brethren once manifested in this cause, and lead to its re-establishment, under more favorable auspices than ever before. W. K. P.

GOOD WORDS FROM OUR CORRESPONDENTS.

INDIANA MISSION.

Bro. Pendleton:—I ever look forward with great pleasure to the day when I have the privilege of sending good news to you in reference to the cause which is dear to every Christian heart. The labors of brethren Jas. Blackenship, J. C. Mathes, J. H. Henry, J. K. Speer, A. Atwater, T. Lockhart, J. H. McCollough, P. B. Wiles, R. A. P. Buchanan, B. C. Sherman, Wm. McIllvaine, J. B. Marshal, Jas. Hadsell, and others, have resulted in 151 additions. We all desire a large attendance at our State Meeting, which convenes in Indianapolis October 9th, at 2 P. M.——In hope of heaven. R. L. Howe.

Bro. Pendleton:—A great work of enlisting soldiers for our Lord's army is now going on in our State. Bro. W. S. Patterson reports his labors, resulting in 204 additions; Bro. A. Hubbard, 15; Bros. Shaw and Prichard, at Jonesville, 137 added; Bros. R. T. Brown and W. S. Howe, 3 added; Bro. Grissum, 26 added; Bro. Adamson, 2; Bro. McIllvaine, 5; Bro. S. Blackenship, 19; Pro. G. A. Porch, 2; and good news from all parts of the State.

In hope, R. L. Howe.

Indianapolis, June 17, 1865.

Dear Bro. Pendleton:—The American Christian Missionary Society reports 229 accessions to the church of Christ since the first of March last, as the immediate result of the labors of the Missionaries now in the field. Quite a number of new congregations have been organized. Prospects were never better—the harvest never riper—and laborers never in greater demand. It is impossible to estimate the amount of good our Society may now accomplish, with the proper co-operation among the brethren. Remember, brethren, that we could this day occupy a score of new fields if we had sufficient funds. Send in your contributions to me at this place.

O. A. Burgess, Cor. Sec. A. C. M. S.

Indianapolis, June 8, 1865.

Beloved Brother Pendleton:—I returned home last week from a tour of seven weeks' preaching. I visited five churches in this State, and one at Russellville, Illinois. I found the five congregations in Knox co., Ind., doing well. Since the commencement of our preaching for them, about the 15th of last November, they have had about 200 additions to the six churches in that county. Brothren Speer and Treat, their county Evangelists, are doing a good work in that county. My preaching during my last visit in April and May, was for the instruction and confirmation of the disciples at Russellville, Illinois. I gave them fifteen discourses, mostly to the members of the church, that were well received. Six were reclaimed, and the members of the congregation much en-

couraged and revived; and they commenced repairs on the meeting-house, which were much needed. We need much more Christian perfection taught in the congregations, and not so much first principles, by the preacher.

As ever, your brother in the Lord, J. B. New.

Bowling Green, Warren co., Ky., June 18, 1865.

Dear Bro. Pendleton:—I embrace the present opportunity to give you a brief sketch of our condition in Bowling Green. By the blessing of our Heavenly Father, the good work has revived in this place. We are again enjoying regular meetings, and have I think the best prospects for a Sunday-school I have ever seen. Our Sunday-school began this morning, with thirty-five scholars, and from present prospects, there will be a very large school here in one month's time. We have employed Bro. M. P. Bailey, of Elkton, Ky., to spend half of his time with us. He speaks the first and second Lord's days in each month, so that we are now enjoying regular preaching and prayer meeting and Sunday-school. We number about 40 in our little band of brethren. Sectarianism is giving way in this region, and the prejudice has subsided here to a great extent.——Yours in one hope, Thos. N. Whitten.

Ashland, O., June 1st, 1865.

Dear Bro. Pendleton:—In April and May, I preached 73 discourses in 45 days, in District No. 16, as Missionary, with the following result: At Richfork, 2 baptized; at Fair Pleasant, 8 baptized and 2 reclaimed; at Cameron, (this church had not met for two or three years,) reclaimed 46 and immersed 16; at Newcastle I spent five week-days—immersed 8 and reclaimed 4. Six meeting-houses were closed at the beginning of my year; four of them are now opened for regular worship: thank God! the others will be.

I have now spent four and a half months in this District, with 74 immersions, and about as many more reclaimed. The work goes on gloriously.

Yours in hope, M. Riddle.

OBITUARIES.

Died at Edgemont, King & Queen, Va., April 16th, 1863, Mrs. Louisa F. wife of Elder Robert Y. Henley, and eldest daughter of the late Sublett McGruder, in the 44th year of her age.

It can be truly said of her that she was one among the loveliest on earth, and the inmates of her once happy home may deeply mourn the loss of the tender, faithful wife, and fond, devoted mother. Possessing an affectionate disposition—a highly cultivated mind—a placid, persisting faith in Christ—a "meek and quiet spirit"—with manners graceful and gentle—retiring and unobtrusive—a heart full of kindness and love,—she won imperceptibly and unceasingly upon the affections of all who associated with her. Her life was quiet, useful and pious, and its close was bright, calm, and triumphant. Oh! that the world could have witnessed her closing hour and heard her words of triumph and of faith. Death to her had no sting, and, while in his cold embrace, she exultantly exclaimed: "Oh! 'tis sweet to die, with Jesus nigh, the rock of my salvation." Calling her family to her (beginning with her servants) one by one, she spoke words to each, and to her friends around her—and such

thoughts and such language! The appeal made to one of her physicians, who was "without hope," was most thrillingly touching. But the faith and resignation of the devoted wife and mother was most conspicuous when bidding a last adieu to her mourning husband and children. The "little ones" were brought, and after many expressions of sympathy and instruction, at her request they bowed their heads upon her and prayed, as was their custom, to her and their God; then kissing them, bade them "good-bye," adding, "This is the last prayer your mother will ever hear from you, and I commit you, without one fear, to that God who watched so tenderly over my *motherless path.*"—To her husband she expressed her warmest gratitude and deepest sympathy, urging him to bear up under the heavy blow which was falling upon him, saying, "*Remember me*, but never think of me as being in the cheerless grave; *I will not be there*—but always think of me as a bright, joyous, happy spirit, in a bright and happy world."

Sweet were these farewell words, and yet we knew their truth before. "Oh, how I love you—*I do love* you all, and what can I say more."

Her husband said to her that the path of death was a rugged way. With a smile of triumph she replied, "Yes, but it will soon end in the full enjoyment of the quietude of life." When reminded that she would meet her parents, sister, and other loved ones in Heaven, she exclaimed with rapture, "*and my Savior too.*" She selected the 25th and 26th verses of the 11th chapter of John as the text for her funeral, and also the hymns, "I would not live always," and "From every stormy wind that blows."

I have witnessed many a dying scene; but none equal to this. How full of hope and comfort! Her words and songs of triumph were often heard while struggling in the deep waters of Jordan, and who of that privileged group will ever forget the joyous expression of her countenance as she sang so sweetly and thrillingly the words—

"If this be death, I soon shall be
From every sin and sorrow free;
I shall the King of Glory see—
All is well—*all is well.*"

Thus passed from earth and its sorrows this lovely one, eminent for goodness, usefulness, and piety. May the memory of her life influence others to live piously, that they too may die joyfully singing—"*All is well.*"

"Heaven called thee on before me, and I would not call thee back,
But I will hope and pray for grace to mark thy shining track.
Heaven's light beamed bright upon it—oh! what would I not resign
Could thy pure life, triumphant death, and peaceful home be mine.
Then let me chide each murmuring thought, I may with thee be blest—
Thy God *my* God, thy Savior mine, and thine shall be my rest." ***

Died, in Pittstown, N. Y., April 29th, 1865, Sister Nancy Rowland, in the 33rd year of her age.

Sister Rowland had been a member of the church of Christ about eight years; and until the close of her life, adorned her profession, by a uniform and consistent Christian character. She was patient and uncomplaining during her last illness, and expressed herself as resigned to the will of God.

She was the only child of Brother Moses Rowland, who is consoled in his loneliness and great affliction, by the blessed hope of soon meeting his sainted daughter where separation is unknown, and joy is unfading.

May the pure life of our departed sister be imitated by us, who mourn her loss, till we meet her in the "city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." A. B. CHAMBERLAIN.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 36.] BETHANY, W. V., *AUGUST*, 1865. [No. VIII.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION.—NO. II.

In our last number we finished our inquiries into the teachings of the New Testament upon the office of Elder, or Bishop, by presenting in a connected view all the allusions and explanations therein made concerning it, either by evangelist or apostle. The result of this search was the conclusion that this office is not formally defined; that the circumstances which led to its institution are not stated; and that, in the first allusions to it, there is reason to believe that its nature and relations were already familiar to those who made up the first Christian churches, to wit: Jews, accustomed to and trained up under the discipline of the synagogue. At the same time we discovered, from the actions referred to this officer and the descriptions given of his qualifications, many important duties which devolved upon him; and thus we were enabled to learn much of practical utility, concerning his official relations. 1. They were to *rule*; 2. *to take heed of the floch*; 3. *to watch against heretics*; 4. *to feed the Church*; 5. *to teach the disciples*; 6. *to labor in word and doctrine*; 7. *to confute gainsayers*; 8. *to exhort*; 9. to be conspicuous for *hospitality*, and 10. *to lay on hands in the ordination of evangelists*. These various duties are all spoken of as properly belonging to the elders or bishops as such, and, whilst some of them, here separately mentioned, may generally be included under the terms used to designate others, the fulness of the scriptural instructions, on this subject, must be the more apparent to all, from the very minute detail which they give us of what an elder should both be and do. We cannot stop now to inquire as we may hereafter do, what is meant by ruling and all the other

terms describing the duties of the elders, but with the single remark, that the Holy Spirit has evidently assigned them an arduous task which they may not lightly avoid or neglect, and given them a rank deserving and requiring the highest respect and veneration from those over whose souls they are still to watch. We proceed to inquire, What do the scriptures teach us concerning the office of Deacon?

We have already adverted to the term and seen that, in its common acceptation, it means simply *minister*; as "minister of God," "minister of the gospel," "minister of circumcision," "minister of the law," &c; so that we mus tlook for its meaning in its official sense, if it have one, out of its simple and primary definition. An induction, then, of the cases in which it is thus employed in the scriptures will best open to us the light of divine truth. The first occurrence of the term in this sense, reckoning chronologically, is in 1 Tim. iii: 8–12. "The deacons in like manner must be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not persons who earn money by base methods; holding fast the secret of the faith in a pure conscience. But let these also be first proved; then let them exercise the office of the deacon, being without blame. Let the deacons be the husband of one wife, ruling well their children and their families. For they who have performed the office of a deacen well procure to themselves an excellent degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus." Here it is expressly taught that this is an *office*, since the performance of his work is called the performance of the *office of a deacon;* but whilst we are informed as to his religious and moral qualifications, nothing is said specifically of his duties. Before they should be called upon to enter on them, it is, indeed, required that they should have been *first proved*. They are to be men of *gravity*, *candor*, *sobriety*, and above the grovelling pursuits of avarice; at the same time noted for their sincere and conscientious adherence to the secret of the faith. They are also to rule well their children and their families; but what they are *to do* as officers is not affirmed.—The practical effects of a faithful discharge of their duties seem to have been the procurement of a higher *degree*, or greater influence and regard, or it may be, promotion to the rank of an elder, and the acquisition of great *boldness in the faith;* but this does not settle the question what those duties were. We have the term employed, in its official sense, in but one other place in the Scriptures, (Phil. i. 1,) where it is merely introduced to indicate that these officers in the church at Philippi, were included in the address; but while the *officer* is not elsewhere spoken of, the *office* is: and in Acts vi. we have the most satisfactory teaching on this subject to be found in the New Testament. It reads thus—"Now, in those days, the number of the

disciples being multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Hellenists against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily *ministration* (*diakonia*). And the twelve, having called the multitude of the disciples together, said, It is by no means agreeable that we should leave the word of God to attend tables; therefore, brethren, look out from among yourselves, seven men of attested character, full of the Spirit and wisdom, whom we may set over this business. We will constantly attend to prayer and the ministry of the Word." Accordingly, they selected seven, and the Apostles having prayed, *laid hands on them*, and thus appointed them over this business. This is an important passage on this subject; for although the seven are not called *deacons*, yet the office they were to perform was *diakonia* (*deaconship*,) and as they acted, in its discharge, by a solemn official appointment, there can be no doubt of the propriety of denominating them *official deacons*. Still, the specific object for which these seven were appointed is all that we are taught, as to the duties of this order. This was the daily *ministration*, which the Apostles afterwards explained to mean the waiting or attending at tables; a service peculiar to the days of a community of goods, and, therefore, no longer needed in the church, in this sense. Yet, as the church still has its fund raised, by weekly contribution, for the assistance and support of the poor, who are always with us, she still has need of this officer, specifically for the same duty. We discover nothing here, however, nor yet in the other allusions to this officer, found in the New Testament, furnishing us with any other light upon the responsibility of the deacons. If we impose anything farther upon them, we must derive our authority for doing so, not from any thing ordained or affirmed concerning them specifically in the Scriptures, but from the general nature of the office, or meaning of the term, or else from the collateral lights that have reached us concerning the primitive usages.

If any one has found, or can discover from the Scriptures alone, that deacons, in the primitive order, were ever appointed for any other duty than this one, of taking care of the destitute, by collecting and appropriating the bounty of the church for their comfort and support, we would like to see the evidence of it. We, of course, include in this duty every thing necessary to its being *well performed*, and, therefore, regard the deacons of a congregation as occupying a rank of high trust; and filling a station calculated to give them great honor and influence among the brethren, which, as members of the kingdom, they must not neglect to employ, by any means in their power, for the advancement of the truth, and the honor of the Lord.

In the discharge of this duty there would, necessarily, arise cases

in which *men* could not, with propriety, act; especially in a country, like the East, where the social intercourse between the sexes was restricted by so many forms; and, therefore, we find that into this order females were introduced, evidently by apostolic sanction. Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, xvi. 1, speaks of Phœbe, as a *deaconess* of the church at Cenchrea, who had been a helper of many, especially of himself; and in the 1 Epistle to Timothy iii. 11, 12, we interpret him as describing their qualifications for office.

How benevolent and wise this arrangement, and how diligent and faithful ought those to be who are entrusted with the delightful charge of ministering, to the sick and needy, those comforts which the church may provide; for inasmuch as you have done it unto even the least of these my little ones, you have done it unto me! Why it is that this apostolic plan, of constituting the deaconship, has been so universally neglected by the various denominations, does not appear, we think, from the Scriptures. Upon reformation principles, a precedent so plainly set forth in the New Testament, cannot, consistently, be disregarded; and we know, that whilst some congregations may not have acted so scripturally upon this subject as the truth requires, it is generally regarded, among our brethren, as an essential element in the restoration of primitive order, to ordain, in every church, both deacons and deaconesses. Thus have we, by a careful induction, gathered from the Scriptures all that they teach us concerning the two official ranks, in the Christian church, to-wit, Elders and Deacons; but in doing so we have gone upon the assumption that elders and bishops are in office the same. But inasmuch as this is a point upon which there is a practical diversity of opinion, among the religionists of the day, we deem it not unworthy of a fair and scriptural examination.

The proof upon this subject may not be manifold; but to one filled with a due reverence for the Sacred Oracles, and a proper respect for apostolic authority, it cannot but be entirely sufficient. The use of the two terms, interchangeably, and that in their proper official sense, ought to be regarded as a sufficient indication of the apostolic will concerning them; and to convince every word-reverencing man that between bishops and elders they recognized no official difference.—In the 17th verse of Acts, and 29th chapter, it is said that Paul, who was at Miletus, "sent to Ephesus and called the elders (*presbuterous*) of the church;" when they had arrived, he addressed them, in a very solemn and impressive manner, upon their official responsibilities.—In this address he says, "Take heed, therefore, to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers* (*episkopous*), that is, *bishops*. Now it is beyond the ingenuity of sectarian

criticism to say that the same officers here evoked as *elders* are not addressed as *bishops*. It is most evident, too, that this latter term was used as a common official title; for, while the metaphor of a *flock* was in the Apostle's mind, he would hardly have rejected its natural correlate, *pastor*, and employed the term *bishop*, had this not been a common and fixed official title. In proper metaphorical style, we do not say, *overseers or bishops of a flock*, but *pastors*; and as this latter term is thus frequently and beautifully employed in the Scriptures, yet, in this place, although so evidently indicated by the style, rejected for another, having no proper metaphorical relation to the figure of a flock, by which a church is represented, we conclude that it must have been because the term selected was one of established technical import, and therefore used officially.

Not to insist farther on this point; let us hear this same apostle, in his directions to Titus. After telling him (chap. 1. 5,) that he had left him in Crete for the purpose of ordaining elders (*presbuterous*) in every city, lest Titus might be misled by these very general instructions, and ordain elders, whether worthy or not, he proceeds to place certain limitations to the injunction;—as "If any be blameless," &c., adding by way of reason, "for a bishop (*episkopos*) must be blameless." Now can any man, in his senses, suppose that such a logician as Paul would give, as a reason for restricting Titus in the ordination of *elders* to such as were *blameless*,—that *bishops must be blameless*,—unless by *bishops* and *elders* he meant the same *officers!* Suppose I were to say, that no man must be elected to the office of *Judge* unless he was honest, and assign as a reason that *kings* must be honest, would not every one see at once that unless I meant to say that *judges* are *kings*, I would be speaking nonsense? Just so with Paul; unless with him *elders* and *bishops* are the same, his reasoning is both inconsequential and incoherent.

In 1 Pet. v. 1, the style is very similar to that of Paul in Acts.—The *elders* which are among you, he says, I exhort: Feed the flock of God, which is with you, exercising the *overseer's* office (*episkopountes*), or discharging the office of *bishops*, not by constraint, but willingly, &c. That the terms are used promiscuously, none can deny; and, it must also be conceded, that this could not have been done, with propriety, if those distinctions which now obtain between bishops and presbyters, or elders, had been at that time recognized; for it will have been observed, that the *elders*, who are now ranked as inferior to bishops, are called, in apostolic style, by these titles: and as the less cannot include the greater, although the greater may include the less, we can not, by any ingenuity of construction, find, in the usage of the apostles, an argument for episcopal supremacy. The apostle Paul called

himself a *minister* or *deacon;* but a *deacon*, simply, is never called an *apostle;* so if the bishops were really superior to the elders, they might, nevertheless, be sometimes called *elders;* but in that case *elders* could never be called *bishops*, as the apostle styles them in the cases referred to. "The truth is," to adopt the language of Doctor George Campbell, "the word *episkopos* (bishop) was properly the name of an office, and *presputeros* (elder) was a title of respect, borrowed from the Jewish custom (which was, indeed, analogous to that of other nations) of calling not only the members of the Sanhedrim *presbuteroi*, elders or deacons, but also the members of the city councils."

It would seem to one imbued with a proper sense of the paramount authority of the Scriptures, in all matters of discipline, that where a clear scriptural proof that the apostles did regard and speak of *elders* and *bishops* as the *same in office*, could be given, controversy should cease, and tradition be silent; but inasmuch as the argument has been pushed beyond this, its sufficient conclusion, it may be proper, very briefly, to advert to what is alleged by the advocates of episcopal supremacy as evidence in their favor, drawn from the apostolic fathers. In doing so, however, it is not to be understood that we consider these as of binding authority in any case; but merely as explanatory to what may not be altogether clear in scriptural allusions. Were an apostolic father, therefore, to speak contrary to the teachings of the apostles, we should not regard it proper to pay the least respect to what he might say; but if anything in the writings of the apostles should be left obscure, or not fully explained, we should have no objection to receiving any light upon the subject which one personally known to them and their principles could give us; provided, always, it was not inconsistent with other things taught us by the apostles, free from ambiguity and doubt. As, therefore, we consider the teachings of the apostles as to the official identity of elders and bishops, to be not only unambiguous, but conclusive beyond a reasonable doubt, nothing which an apostolic father could say, could, in the least, affect our conclusions on this subject.

Yet, as our minds are so constituted as to feel it strange that one well acquainted with the customs of the apostles should, so near to their day, teach any thing contrary to their lessons, we cannot, when we hear it affirmed, but experience more or less dissatisfaction, and desire to examine into the mattter to see if there is not some solution to it at once true and sufficient; and we enter upon the inquiry the more readily, from the conviction that, as truth is always consistent with itself, these fathers, in favor of whose knowledge and veracity there is a strong presumption, cannot be found, when faithfully represented

and rightly understood, to differ at all from the apostles. It is the same feeling and the same confidence with which we desire to meet and seek an investigation with the skeptical geologist. We are sure, before we have learned the meaning of *fossil-remains*, that nothing has been found which the author of the Bible did not know all about, for he had created it and laid it there, in the ages of his own appointment; and, therefore, we not only do not fear, but anxiously desire to see uncovered all the wonders of his hand, confident that his wisdom and his power are always in harmony. With the patience of our readers, then, we shall endeavor at our next sitting to say a few things upon the authority of the apostolic fathers, concerning this long arrogated claim of episcopal supremacy; and if we do not overturn, as we have no hope that we will, this cherished error of a lordly hierarchy, we trust, at least, to be able to give good reasons for not embracing it ourselves. W. K. P.

UNITARIAN CONVENTION.

During the first week in April, there met in the city of New York the first general Unitarian Convention ever held in this country; and in many respects it was the most remarkable religious body ever assembled in America. It was the first effort to bring together, and into some sort of co-operative union, all the loose, floating, disjointed, unallied religious elements in the land,—all that rejoices in the name 'liberal.' How such a mass of active, discordant materials, whose only bond of fellowship was perfect freedom to disagree on all points of positive truth, could be manipulated and brought to harmonize on any practical matter, is a problem of no little interest. As a question of religious history, we cannot overlook this strange phenomenon in our moral heavens. What a Christianity that has denied 'the Lord who bought us' is, what it does and can do; whence and from what causes it has originated, and by what processes it has come to be what it is; what is its power in our land, and what may be expected from it as a religious and moral potency,—what lessons it teaches us on the important, vital question of individual and congregational religious freedom of opinion and doctrine,—all these are questions every way worthy of our thoughtful attention.

It may be stated here, that according to their own published statistics, Unitarianism, outside of New England, is as yet very weak in numbers, in life and activity; and even in its paradise, New England, it is manifesting but little power, and has brought forth,—in the Unitarian view,—but small fruits of good in a missionary way. This is

their own testimony; and to remedy all this, was really the expressed motive for calling this convention. In the words of the call, it was for the purpose "of considering the best means of awakening our denominational life; of consolidating our work, and agreeing upon common plans of Christian usefulness." Several of the leading Unitarians have again and again deplored the fact that so little has been accomplished by them. It is, indeed, a very striking fact, that with all their talent and learning and means, Unitarians have done so little, even of what they call, good. This is something worth noting.

Unitarianism has already come to assume so many shapes, that it really has no proper, fixed shape; it means so many things, that it really means nothing positive. In the discussion of the call, the question was raised, "for the promotion of *what* theological ideas (always *ideas!*) the convention was to be asked to adopt methods; whether for what was styled 'old-fashioned Unitarianism, the Evangelical, or the Rationalistic wing.'" Old fashioned, 'Channing Unitarianism,' is evidently, however, on the swift decline; 'Evangelical Unitarianism,' is breathing out its last breath, and the 'Rationalistic wing,' repluming itself for ever-varied, wandering, gyrating flights, will soon be the only form of this apostasy left.

In the New Testament we are taught that "we are builded upon prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone."—Dr. Bellows, one of the most conservative, as he himself claims, of his people, teaches us in the proceedings calling the convention, "that the corner stone of the Unitarian body, as distinguished from other ecclesiastical bodies, must continue to be liberty of thought"; and adds, "that the denomination should unite only on a platform broad enough to sustain the whole brotherhood who *claimed* the name and faith." It was with this creed, on this foundation and platform, that this convention met. One writer on the subject says: "Our only peculiar tenet, in which we are all agreed, is, really, to disagree, if we see cause. The Convention meets then in these interests."—"The movement must be purely in the interest of the uttermost liberality and independence of thinking upon all subjects. To attempt organizing as Unitarians merely, will inevitably produce discord, and result in schism." The Rev. Dr. Clarke, of Boston, in delivering the opening sermon of the convention, expressed the hope that "in making a new change of base for Christianity, the convention would gather together and embrace all who regarded themselves as sincere seekers after truth; all who followed out to their results *the intuitions of their own nature*, whether Unitarians or Universalists, Spiritualists, Naturalists, or whatever they may be. He was willing also to embrace on the same ground, Catholics and orthodox Protestants, if they

would adopt the principles of free inquiry." A *Rev.* Mr. Towne,* "wanted the door opened so as to let in all, including Spiritualists and come-outers."

With such 'fundamental' views as the above predominating in the body, it may be well imagined what success the proposal would meet with that was made by Dr. Bellows in the call, and advocated by a few in the convention, to have some sort of a creed "or expression of Christian belief, which, without being forced on anybody, or made a condition of fellowship and communion, should furnish a rallying-cry, and articulate the belief of the largest possible number of existing Unitarians, as well as crystallize the ideas now in solution in millions of American minds, on the subject of the Christian faith." This proposal, however, of Dr. Bellows, backed by a few others, met before and at the convention with a poor reception, and his process of crystallization was sadly disturbed. No crystals of any shape, indeed, were formed; and these 'ideas' are still, and were allowed mercifully and 'liberally' to remain, in 'solution.' The convention refused to 'rally,' to the Doctor's watchword, and a creed offered by

---

* It is possible *some* of the readers of the Harbinger may have supposed, that in our strictures on 'Liberal Christianity,'—this van-guard of Unitarianism,—we may have been too severe in calling it infidelity. To dispel all doubts from their minds, we give below a specimen of the free faith, or rather, no-faith of this class of *Christians*,—for so they too insist on calling themselves. Notice the savage bitterness of the animus that moves in this extract. It is from the 'Friend of Progress' for March. What kind of 'progress" is here intended, can easily be seen. We may observe also that the *Rev.* O. B. Frothingham, of Unitarian liberal notoriety, is also one of the writers in this magazine. The following extract is from a notice of H. W. Beecher, by this same *Rev.* Mr. Towne. The utter and awful *irreverence* of these lost souls, is a terrible satire on the title of *Reverend*, which they, also, yet persist in wearing. Were it not that we believe that the true character of these men, and this tendency, should be fully known, we would not stain our pages with such an extract. This is our apology for producing it here. C. L. L.

"The Bible is to-day undergoing an examination in the high court of progressive faith in spiritual things, the like of which has never taken place, and, by the the testimony at least of Mr. Beecher, its claim as an authoritative letter must be set aside. It will be dismissed to its own place at the head of wonderful books, to be used as other literatures are, for suggestion and assistance in the search for divine truth, while to the true man will be granted absolute freedom to find the mind of God by communion with the Spirit and study, and to follow or depart from the terms of all books whatsoever.

"God did not tell nursery stories to Moses and play at truth with David.—The foolish in Genesis *is* foolish. The bad in the Psalms *is* bad. The obscene and vile in Hebrew history is no better than that in Shakspeare. When Abraham lied, he *lied*. When Jacob was a scoundrel, he was just that. This imaginative nursery stuff, which is a great point in Mr. Beecher's theology, is simply nonsense."

a lay member, a Mr. Low, of Brooklyn, embodying the views of the conservative element, was unceremoniously and swiftly laid on the table. The trouble about a creed was not a lack of scriptural authority, a respect for the Bible, or a fear of infringing upon the authority of God and his word. The question of divine authority, —we appeal to the full reports for proof,—never occurred to this convention; it was never 'dreamed of in their philosophy.' The whole burden of the objection was that it limited human freedom; it did not allow every body to think and say what he pleased. Nor was it the question whether they would have a divine creed,—the Bible,—or a human creed, or the latter in exposition of the former;—but would they have *any* creed or rule of faith. They decided on having none of any kind, except perhaps it be this: "We believe that every body may believe what he pleases";—and they might have added to this weighty, solemn, and august symbol of faith, the awful refrain of the Augsburg Confession, "et damnamus omnes secus docentes,—*and we condemn all teaching otherwise;* for none more bitterly denounce others than these very 'liberal Christians.'

The question "What think you of Christ," of course was the subject of much discussion. It is of interest to know what the "ideas" were on this vital point. In Dr. Bellows' creed, read before the committee calling the convocation we have these articles, expressing the more conservative view:

"I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ his Son; and in the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father and his Son; in the Holy Catholic Church, in the forgiveness of sins, in the resurrection from the dead, and the life everlasting. Amen!"

"If a gloss on this creed be necessary, or if a negative side to it be considered desirable, it may safely be said:

"1. That Liberal Christians believe in the derived and dependent position of Jesus Christ; and, while acknowledging the eternity and deity of "the Word," which is God in essence, deny the proper deity of Jesus Christ, "the Word" manifest or incarnate, and necessarily losing deity by coming into sight and within boundaries.—While Jesus Christ, therefore, is God "manifest in the flesh," he is not God in the sense of the Creator, who is essentially invisible.

"2. They believe the reconciling and atoning work of Jesus Christ to be in bringing human souls to the true knowledge and friendship of God, through his life and death, but not in any sacrifice required to reconcile God to man, or make him more placable and loving than he is in his own nature and character."

In Mr. Low's formula we have it thus: "Belief in one Lord Jesus Christ, our Savior; the Son of God and his especially appointed Messenger and Representative to our race, gifted with supernatural power, 'approved of God by miracles and signs and wonders which God

did by him,' and thus by Divine authority commanding the devout and reverential faith of all who claim the Christian name."

It will be observed that the great work we value in Jesus Christ above all else, his atoning sacrifice on the cross, without which all else is vain, is positively denied in the first and omitted in the second of these symbols. So is also his divinity denied. Thus the heart, soul, and life of the gospel are taken utterly away. And yet, these forms of belief, soulless and Christless as they are, were too "orthodox," and so were rejected, the former before the convention by the public voice of these people, the second formally so at the convention. The following declarations on this point show the deep depths of licentiousness of soul many of the "liberals" have already sunk to. The Rev. Mr. Towne said: "He claimed that Jesus Christ was a servant, not a Lord, and his followers should be regarded as servants." Rev. Mr. Watson, of Cincinnati, said:

"For one he could not call Jesus Christ '*Lord*.' He could not accept the word *Lord* in the sense in which other Christians accepted it. They had put aside temporal lordship in America long since, let them also do so in religion. Jesus Christ came to benefit the race; but place him over the head of any man, and he would object to it. Christ did not come to be a Lord over them; he came to emancipate mankind; and he (the speaker) did not want any one to be thrust between himself and God. He would never be domineered over by any one. He also objected to the use of the phrase '*Son of God*,' as applied to Christ, if by it they meant that he was a son in any different sense from that in which we are all sons of God."

C. C. Burleigh, known in past days as a general reform lecturer, appeared at the convention as a "minister of a Unitarian church.—He endorsed what Mr. Watson had said, but insisted that those who called Christ *Lord* did not know the meaning of the Scriptures. The word *Lord*, in the language of the Bible, did not mean Lord; it did not mean even Master; it only meant *Mister*, and all the Apostles meant to call Jesus Christ was simply *Mr.* Jesus Christ." Mr. Burliegh's notoriously infidel views had raised some objections against his being received as a member of the assembly; but it was shown that he had full and fair credentials, and he was received into full fellowship.

What shall we say of a body of men calling itself Christian that has such men in it, and where such outrageous follies and impieties are allowed? It is not saying too much to declare, that there really is manifested in these men a spirit of bitterness towards the dignity and authority of Christ in the New Testament. This body failed utterly to declare any harmonious "idea" of the Son of God. This great foundation truth is left at large as a non-essential; every one may think of him, and call him what he pleases.

The spirit of extreme, licentious "freedom of thought" that was uttered by so many alarmed even Dr. Bellows, and he could not but raise a voice of remonstrance. He "has serious objections to bodies of men claiming to be peculiar champions of liberty. He yielded to no one in devotion to the spirit of liberty. If intolerance was to be found at all, it was among those who sneered at conservatives and thanked God that they were not such;—sneered at those who wanted to conserve that which they regarded as eternal truth. We heard a great deal about the spirit of the age. He did not believe in it. He thought we ought to control the spirit of the age, and not to be controlled by it. * * * He would rather go with orthodoxy in any form in which it could be stated than with those who put Jesus Christ into comparative contempt."—So also Mr. Low, a layman of Brooklyn, declared "he would not accept Mr. Clarke's 'change of base,' but preferred to retain Christ as his foundation." These were the better words heard in this Babel; but they are words that will fail of any effect. The 'vanguard' of this body will bear off the victory.

Rev. Dr. Clarke preached the opening sermon, on Acts 13: 46,—"Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold and said, It is necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing you put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." This," said he, "to use a military phrase, was making a change of base. The apostles had hitherto drawn their supplies from Judaism; henceforth they were to appeal to the universal instincts of human nature." Here we see what ideas these men have of the inspiration and mission of the apostles; and how fearfully they can pervert the plainest words of the Word of God. 'The instincts of human nature' are to them the source of light and truth, not God, by his Spirit in his Word. 'Is God God, or is man God?' is the ever-recurring question. These men are drifting to the full acceptation and assertion of the second part of this question.

Looking over the full report before us, in several New York papers, of the proceedings of this convention, we cannot but be struck with the sad evidences of the fearful progress downward made by the Unitarian churches of New England, the offspring and representatives of the Pilgrim fathers, in their religious career. These are the ecclesiastical heirs of what were once the stern Puritans! This is an assembly of ministers and delegates from the very churches, largely, established and long maintained by these same unbending, strict, Calvinistic Puritans, that by civil law once punished men for denying the Trinity, the divinity of Christ,—made laws to bore the tongues of

such heretics through with a hot iron! How truly extremes beget each other! Yet it is a sad picture such an assembly presents—a terrible and mournful caricature of Christian faith! O Christianity, O sacred name of Christ! what crimes are committed in thy name! Could the spirit of the illustrious Channing look down upon this convention and hear their blasphemies and impieties, their loose and reckless abandonment and denunciation of what he yet held sacred,—how he would be stirred with indignation at the base throng, and at the degradation of the work he sought to accomplish! Yet even in the hands of this great apostle of American Unitarianism, this system had committed the fatal sin of robbing Christianity of its celestial majesty, and its power to save the world, in robbing Christ of his true divinity, and the cross of its significance. The worm was then at the core of the system, and quick decay and death have been its inevitable doom.

It is surely an evidence of a thorough soundness of faith in Christ, a clear understanding of the Christian religion, and of earnest, wise vigilance on the part of Bro. A. Campbell, that he always earnestly opposed every approach of this insidious form of essential error.—Again and again, as it sought favor and fellowship, did he boldly rebuke it. When the proposition was made some twenty years ago to accept a union with the body of Bible Christians in the East, known to be more or less Unitarian in their views, he at once rejected it, and exposed the vital error in their faith. And it was well he did it.—Many of those very churches with whom a union was proposed, are now fully in the bosom of the Unitarianism represented in the convention we have been reviewing. These Bible Christians, and the other Unitarians specifically so called, in common own and support Meadville College and Antioch College, which were both objects of care before the Convention.

Unitarianism, even in its mildest, oldest form, is the fatal beginning that will inevitably set the minds and souls of men adrift in the dark waters that are drifting all that is on and in them to the final whirlpool of bald, blasphemous infidelity—to the very state of loose, vagrant, licentious liberalism illustrated by this Babel that met in New York. Unitarianism in its full ripeness,—and to that it will always come,—is a realization of the wonderfully significant and suggestive words of the angel at the grave of Christ—"Ye seek the *living* among the *dead*;—he is not dead but risen!" Unitarianism in its full development, seeks for and preaches a *dead* Christ among the dead, and essays to save the world by him. To them these words of the angel are one of the 'nursery tales,' one of the 'extravagancies' of the ignorant evangelists. "Ye seek the *living* among the dead"! To

us "he is not dead but alive"! to *us* he ever liveth to make intercession for us." We know that *now* "by his *life* we are saved"! It is the ever-living Christ whom *we* preach, and by whom the world is saved. These blind, erring, terribly deceived men,—these 'wandering stars,' these dark, foul waves, "foaming out their own shame,"—let it ever be well remembered,—are seeking "the *living* among the *dead!*"

May we cherish, not as a mere watchword or formula of words, but in all its true, real import, only that great foundation of faith, Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God!—and have daily a higher appreciation of his great atoning sacrifice on the Cross, the shedding of his blood, the offering of his life, as the only ground of forgiveness of sins, of acceptance with God, and of a final inheritance of eternal life!—in its full development, as the only power of God unto salvation to every one that believes, from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth! C. L. L.

CHRONICLES.

ELOQUENCE.

How few preachers understand the art of public speaking, and therefore succeed in producing a true and permanent impression on the minds of their hearers. The training they receive in school and college but illy prepares them for their work. The declamatory style of address so common on the rostrum, when carried into the pulpit, is evil and only evil. It is the most heartless and artificial method of address ever adopted. It fails in calling out the resources of the mind and the deep feelings of the heart both of the speaker and hearer. Let any one listen to the declamations of the Sophomore and Junior in our colleges, and he will be assured that there is scarcely a sentence uttered in which the soul of the speaker is moved. He is governed by the sound of his own voice, and he speaks simply to the ear. If he is faultless in the rules of his art, it is all that is required. When he comes before an audience, and rants and roars and raves, the people are unmoved, as they know that it is all smoke and ashes, all sound and verbiage. The heart is not in it. It is elocution, not true eloquence.

What was it that made Nathan so impressive and effective in his address to King David, in the parable of the Ewe Lamb, in which he converted his hearer into a judge, and compelled him to pronounce judgment in his own case? He stood convicted, reproved, condemned, ashamed; and confessing his sin, sought for pardon. Was there ever so direct, so searching, so withering an appeal, as "*Thou* art the

man"! It was the lightning that broke suddenly from a cloud full of electricity, and it was not only stunning but deadly. It was awful and soul-subduing? Who could live under it? The king trembled before the prophet, and nature was struck dumb before the majesty of truth. The secrets of the palace in a moment were revealed; and the more dread secrets of a deceived heart were confessed. Do you think that Nathan strutted and walked on stilts and affected the tricks of the orator, in the story of the "Ewe Lamb"? He was as calm as a summer's eve. He told his story as a mother would do it to a child. He exhibited no passion but what was fitting the occasion. The story was a tender one—and simple as tender. It was soon told. His voice was mellow and sad, and the narrative had all the *naivete* of truth and fact to give it importance. But see how straight—how direct was the arrow. It reached the heart. Did Nathan speak as the sophomore? Did he declaim as the school boy? Nathan spoke as a man much *impressed* with what he uttered, and the effect was sure.

What gave Garrick, Kean and Mrs. Siddons such power on the stage, or Whitfield such power in the pulpit? Did they *act* their part? No, they *lived* it. They stood transfigured before the people, and seemed to be what they personified. They spoke just what they felt —nothing more. They had the power, or acquired it, of transforming themselves into the characters they represented; and the ideal became to them the real, and so appeared to their hearers. Did they stop to think what effect they were producing on the audience, or speak for effect? They lost sight of their audience, and spoke the truth for the truth's sake, and in relation to the parties spoken to. Side-pieces had no influence over them. Does a man in looking at the falls of Niagara, begin to analyze his feelings under the sight? Alas for the cataract, if he does! To him it is but a gutter—a water-pipe, an empty splurge, a splash. Let him look, and look on, until the current, eddy, whirlpool, plunge, with its awful billows, ground swell and surges enter into his soul, and he will carry them with him through life.—They will become a part of his being. He need not care about the philosophy of the scene; this will take care of itself. The science of fluids in motion—Hydrodynamics or Hydraulics—do not enter into the realization of the sight.

Do not ventilate your subjects; let your subjects ventilate you.—Do not inflate your lungs with gas—gas is a nauseous fluid—inflate them with vital air. Let there be no tempest without a cloud, and such a cloud as produces tempests. Do not puff and snuffle, nor bluster; affect no *old Virginny* sing-song, *serio-comic* tones. Be true to nature. Despise all art that does not lead to this. Imiitate no one, but make the best of yourself. Whatever is good in you, is bet-

ter for you, than the best, borrowed from another. I wish I could say a word to some of my young brethren—that would be understood and appreciated. It would save them years of trouble and mortification. It might save their lives and make them ten-fold more useful. Quit that loud, boisterous, and declamatory style of speaking. You think that it is necessary to convert the people, to move them to action. It only reaches a class—and a stupid one at best. You don't know what is in you. You have never felt the solid basis of your own mind yet. You have only given out the scum and foam that rest or float upon the surface. Go down into the depths of that mighty sea—the gold and the pearls and the gems are there. Be a bold diver—but it demands courage, skill and strength and great calmness. You may be a bubble if you please, but the world wants something beside bubbles. The world is calling for thought—for men who think.

James Challen.

MODERN DEMONOLOGY.

[We take the following article from the pages of Blackwood's Magazine. It is a needed rebuke of a most wicked and villainous imposture, and will be especially interesting to us, since it reveals to *what base uses* a man once honored and loved as a minister of the gospel, *may return*, under the fatal corruption of this spiritualistic philosophy. J. B. Ferguson was once the most popular preacher in Nashville, and will be remembered as the man who was many years ago exposed in the Harbinger for his *post-mortem gospel*, by which he proposed to explain the theology of Universalism! It needs not "imgagination to follow the noble dust of Alexander, till he find it stopping a bung-hole!" Let us take warning and avoid these familiar spirits that now, as ever in the past, are in league with Satan, and touch only to corrupt every one that submits to their jugglery or believes their lies.—W. K. P.]

If King James of pious memory, the first who swayed the double scepter of Britain, could revisit this terrestrial sphere, great would be his exultation in finding that, in the present year of grace, his original theories upon the subject of witchcraft and demonology have, after the neglect of centuries, obtained a wide recognition and acceptance. Well indeed might he exult; for the doctrine which he so strenuously maintained has, in our days, not only been enforced by argument, but illustrated by positive demonstration. Wizards, and men who are served by familiar spirits, make open avowal of their powers, and exhibit their cantrips before the public at a fixed money-tribute fo

admittance. The necromancer of the olden time was a sneaking fellow, who hid himself in dingy garrets or fetid cellars, practising his occult arts with as much secresy and precaution as are observed by the coiner and the forger. The witch who molested our ancestors by her incantations—torturing them by virtue of pins thrust into waxen images, or subjecting those sympathetic effigies to the slow action of a fire fed with wolf's bane and the fat of murderers—avoided the public ken, and admitted no spectators to that mysterious *seance* where her *succubi* hopped round her in the semblance of toads, and Beelzebub himself, in the figure of a satyr, preached blasphemous sermons to the beldames. Our modern sorcerers are fellows of a different kidney. They affect publicity, exhibit before Imperial Courts, claim acquaintance with and become the instructors of men of rank and science, and are hand-in-glove with the spirits of departed heroes, who most obligingly obey their summons, impart communications, and playfully condescend to pinch the legs of the incredulous spectators. Let but the Yankee Prospero command, and the ghost of Washington will play on the banjo, Socrates jingle the tambourine, and Byron perform with the bones. Realized to the full extent, and sworn to as an undoubted fact by a whole cloud of Cockney witnesses, is the vaunt of Faustus, as told by Christopher Marlowe:—

> "Have I not made blind Homer sing to me
> Of Alexander's love, and Œnon's death?
> And hath not he that built the walls of Thebes
> With ravishing sounds of his melodious harp,
> Made music with my Mephistophiles?"

No more. To prove the unrivaled and still undecayed vigor of the ancient athletes, Milo of Cotona will bind the Brothers Davenport with ropes, and the indomitable Achilles will sustain Mr. Home while sprawling, like a gigantic spider, at the ceiling!

We suspect, however, that King James, if included in the troop of *revenants*, would feel both indignant and disgusted at the laxity of the civil magistrate, in permitting witchcraft and sorcery to be openly practised as a branch of lucrative traffic. Upon this head our British Solomon entertained very decided opinions, not mincing the matter as regards either the principals or their abettors. Touching magicians and witches, he says—"They ought to be put to death according to the law of God, the civil and imperial law, and the municipal law of all Christian nations." As also—"All them that are of the counsel of such crafts; for, as I said, speaking of *Magie*, the consulters, trusters-in, overseers, entertainers, or stirrers up of these craft-folks, are equally guilty with themselves that are the practisers." And this infliction of punishment he held to be so paramount a duty, that any

leniency shown by the magistrate was equivalent to participation in the crime. "The prince or magistrate, for further trial's cause, may continue the punishing of them such a certain space as he thinks convenient: but in the end to spare the life, and not to strike when God bids strike, and so severely punish in so odious a fault and treason against God, it is not only unlawful, but doubtless no less sin in that magistrate nor it was in Saul's sparing of Agag; and so comparable to the sin of witchcraft itself, as Samuel alleged at that time." It was in accordance with such views that the celebrated statute entitled 'An Act against Conjuration, Witchcraft, and dealing with evil and wicked Spirits,' had been framed by Parliament; and re-enacted with even more stringency in the fifth year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Multitudes of convictions ensued; but in process of time the British public sickened at the spectacle of wretched old women consumed to ashes at the stake, on the accusation of having bewitched their neighbor's cows, diabolically abstracted their milk, or terrified their children into fits by nocturnal visitations under the form of enormous cats; and some philosophers ventured even to hint a doubt whether the Prince of Darkness had so much spare time as to permit of his indulging in familiar intercourse with the dregs and offscourings of society. So, by chapter fifth of 9th George II, it was enacted, that thereafter "no prosecution, suit, or proceeding shall be commenced or carried on against any person or persons for witchcraft, sorcery, enchantment, or conjuration, or for charging another with any such offense, in any court whatsoever in Great Britain." This humane statute put an end to the atrocities of the faggot and the tar-barrel; but it neither gave nor was intended to give full license and immunity to the professors of the occult sciences, insomuch as it provided that, "if any person pretend to exercise or use any kind of witchcraft, sorcery, enchantment, or conjuration, or undertake to tell fortunes," &c., he or she shall for such offenses suffer imprisonmeut for the space of a whole year, and shall be exposed once every quarter in the pillory, at the public market-place. Though modern squeamishness has led to the disuse of that fine old English institution, the pillory—an engine which we venture to think was especially suited for the exposure and chastisement of villainous quacks, impostors, and other detestable miscreants—there can be no doubt that wizards, real or pretended, may still be punished by imprisonment; and it is high time that the penalties of the law should be enforced. We write this in sober earnest; for the infamous and blasphemous pretensions of these mountebanks, made bold by impunity, have now swollen to such an extent, and have so affected the minds of many weak and credulous people, that a strong example has become necessary. Nay more—if

equal-handed justice is to be administered in the British Islands, the officers of the law have no excuse for allowing those audacious quack-salvers to escape. Every now and then we learn, from the newspapers, that some tattered gypsy-woman or prowling mendicant has been sent to the treadmill for cozening an unfortunate servant girl of her hoarded silver, under the pretext of telling her fortune; and such paragraphs usually contain an expression of pity for the deplorable ignorance and superstition of the lower orders, which render them a prey to such impostors. Whereas, in London, the better-clad pretenders to witchcraft openly advertise their *seances*, at which spirits of the illustrious departed will favor the company with manifestations, and perform divers miracles; they inveigle crowds of noodles and ninny-hammers to pay down their money at the door—exhibit some hocus-pocus of a kind so ineffably childish, that the weakest imp of Erebus would be ashamed of participating in the game—and, instead of being sent to join the gypsy in her wholesome exercise and diet of diluted gruel, are fed, pampered, and puffed by crazy enthusiasts, who believe that they have had communication with the ghosts of their grandfathers, and that the Bounding Brothers, whom no network of ropes can fetter, are, upon the whole, much deeper adepts in necromancy than the celebrated Witch of Endor!

If, however, we are to believe the statements of their disciples, the imprisoning of these eminent magicians would be of very little use, seeing that the spirits, who are their familiars, and constantly wait upon them, are able to set them free. Perhaps the most revolting feature in the books on pseudo magic and spiritualism which have recently issued from the press, is the reiterated assertion that miracles, similar to those recorded in the New Testament, are wrought by, or in favor of, the fellows who, like Simon Magus, use sorcery and bewitch the people. Those of our readers who are fortunately ignorant of the tone, nay, possibly, of the very existence of this corrupted literature, will be slow to credit that such daring impiety could be committed without meeting with immediate reprobation. Yet such is the fact. One of the books before us, purporting to be a biography of the Brothers Davenport—a book, by the way, containing more absolute rubbish than any volume of a similar size which it ever was our lot to encounter—contains an account of a pretended miracle, which is neither more nor less than a deliberate parody of St. Peter's deliverance from prison, as narrated in the Acts of the Apostles.—These Davenports, who have recently been exhibiting in London, claim to be attended by spirits, the most potent of whom announced himself to be the ghost of Henry Morgan, the buccaneer. In some respects those spirits had not altogether divested themselves of their

former attributes of humanity. They, according to Mr. Rand, who acted as the Davenports' showman, and doubtless took the money at the doors, "have spoken with audible voices, in the light, without a trumpet, as we have rode or walked by the way, and exhibited hands, placing them upon our persons, and handling us freely"—(had Mr. Rand been a fellow of any pluck, he would have resented such a scandalous liberty by tweaking the nose of the apparition). "Spirits have also *eaten food* in our presence; cake, fish, boiled corn, pineapple, and other fruits!!" Did they not also partake of mint-juleps, brandy cock-tails, phlegm-cutters, and other approved Yankee restoratives for the delectation of the inner spirit? Why not? Spirits are often afflicted by thirst—a phenomenon which undoubtedly leads to a melancholy conclusion. Honest William Howitt, who is more intimately acquainted with Pandemonium than any of his literary compeers, gives us, in his 'History of the Supernatural,' a singular instance of this, which occurred at the Castle of Slavensick, in Silesia. It seems that venerable fortalice (the existence of which we are content to assume) was haunted by divers frolicsome spirits; who persisted in pitching knives, spoons, candlesticks, snuffers, and padlocks at the worshipful company present. "What was the strangest of all, the terror-stricken inhabitants saw a jug of beer raise itself, pour beer into a glass, and the beer drunk off; on seeing which, John, the servant, exclaimed, 'Lord Jesus! it swallows!'" On which anecdote, and his implicit belief in its authenticity, we congratulate friend William, and dismiss him with a hearty wish that *his* swallow may never be less.

To the economic mind such phenomena must suggest topics of considerale alarm. According to the modern doctrine, we are surrounded by the disembodied spirits of the whole progeny of Adam; and as the number of the dead is infinitely greater than that of the living, such symptoms of unearthly appetite, sharpened doubtless by long-continued fast, are, to say the least of it, sufficiently alarming. The Red Indians were wont to provide some small *viaticum* for a deceased brother, in the shape of a handful or so of maize and a little dried venison, to sustain him on his way to the happy hunting-grounds; but it never entered into the head of either Cherokee or Choctaw that the defunct Bald Eagle or Snapping Turtle of their tribe would haunt, for all time to come, the wigwams of themselves and their children, laying violent invisible hands on their stock of buffalo-meat and beaver-tail, and causing it to disappear as swiftly as though it had been engulphed in the maw of some monstrous anaconda! If this new manifestation should become general, and Lar and Lemur should take possession of our larders, we must look for a universal famine.

In the natural course of events it is not unusual that the substance of the parents should be devoured by the children; but what is that to the curse of being compelled to find food for countless generations of ancestors, whose sharp-set spirits crowd ravenously into the dining-room at the cheerful summons of the bell, perpared to do fuller justice to the comestibles than any horde of aldermen that ever flocked to a City banquet? Upon one point alone we require further information. According to Howitt and Rand, the spirits have a decided predilection for articles of food and drink. As many of them have admitted their Yankee origin, it would be interesting to know whether they continue to chew tobacco.

But to recur to the parody of the miracle. It appears that the Masters Davenport, accompanied by their showman Rand, arrived in the course of their peregrinations at Oswego, and as usual advertised an exhibition, with the view of extracting some dollars from the pockets of the soft-heads. "At this place," says our ridiculous Plutarch, "while giving a private *seance*, they were arrested at the instigation of some persons whom Mr. Rand describes as 'legal bigots and persecutors,' who, 'with fiendish exultation,' conducted them before the village magistrate, where they were charged with violating a municipal law, which provides that persons exhibiting shows, circuses, menageries, &c., should procure a license." Rand, who seems, like his compatriot Barnum, to be an adept in stump oratory, undertook his own defense and that of his interesting proteges. "He made a speech filled with scriptural quotations, and resting upon the facts of the case." But his eloquence was of no avail. The Rhadamanthus of Oswego found the charge proven, and imposed a fine of thirteen dollars thirty-nine cents; or in default, one month's imprisonment at the county jail

Martyrs, as a matter of course resist payment of fines. That they act wisely in preferring imprisonment to divorce from their dollars, is evidenced by the notorious fact that the consolations which they receive from friends, not merely in the shape of empty sympathy, but in the more substantial form of silver teapots and donations, amply recompense them for their sufferings, and far exceed the amount they could have earned by honest industry within the period of their durances. Such resistance is a favorite device of Dissenters when called upon in any legal form to contribute to the maintenance of the Established Churches; and not a few pigheaded shopkeepers have been rewarded for their contumacy by a large measure of notoriety, increased custom, and a handsome suscription among the brethren.—Beyond this general principle the Davenports and their bear leader had an additional reason for standing out, inasmuch as "the intelli.

gences who directed their movements told them not to pay a farthing!' Henry Morgan, the buccaneer, was not the kind of ghost to counsel pusillanimous submission. So to jail they went, where "they were met by their friends; and the first thing done after entering the prison, was to give a *seance for the benefit of the jailer*, who was as curious as the rest of the world to witness the manifestations." The amount of the sum which thus accrued to the American M'Guffog is not stated, but it must have been considerable, for we are presently told that "the jailer became interested, and inquired why the mysterious forces, so worthy of 'scientific investigation,' did not unlock their prison doors? He had not long to wait for a practical answer to the question."

Mark what follows. "The last night came." They were all together in the room, Mr. Rand and the two brothers Davenport, and he took the boys by the hand, and talked like a father to them. The jailer came to the door at the usual locking-up time, and asked if they were all there. "We answered promptly to the call that we were." He put on a new lock, which they had never seen. "Then," says Mr. Rand, "immediately, sooner than we expected, a voice spake in the room, and said that I was to go out that night. I was told to put on my coat and hat, and be ready. It was oppressively warm in our small room, with the window and door both closed, and I asked if I could be allowed to sit with my coat off, as I did not expect that we should be released for more than an hour; but the answer was: 'Put on thy coat and hat—be ready.' Immediately, not more than twenty minutes from the time we were locked up, the door was thrown open, and a voice said, 'Now, go quickly; take with you the rope (one which had been in the room), go to yonder garrett window, and let thyself down and flee from this place; we will take care of the boys. There are many angels present, though but one speaks.' The boys came out with me into the hall, took up the lock which lay on the floor, and for the first time examined it, and spoke of its being warm. They were told (by the voice) to return to the room, and the door was locked again." Mr. Rand, having made his way out of the jail, expected the boys to follow him. He told a friend whom he met that they were coming, and wrote the same to his wife, who was then in Massachusetts. It never occurred to him that the door was relocked. He says solemnly: "It matters not to me what force these statements may have on the minds of others: I make them because they are true. Before God and man I make them, and shall make them while I exist; and——" but we omit the remainder of this blasphemous assertion.

We are not inclined to be overstrict in our estimate of the morals of

showmen. Their calling is of a kind which justifies—if any thing can do so—a deviation into the realms of Munchausen; and, in point of fact, they are in the aggregate a pack of undaunted liars. Barnum, the chief of the tribe, piques himself upon his utter contempt of truth; and with a fine but inconsistent honesty, admits that he has been at once the most daring and the most successful impostor of his age. Without presuming to impugn the high estimate which that distinguished practitioner has set upon his own abilities, we venture to think that his countryman, Lyman, who introduced the Aztec children to the notice of Europe, was no unworthy competitor; for his splendid story of the abduction of the princely dwarfs from the long-hidden city of the Incas, was as fine a specimen of romance as has been woven since the days of Heliodorus. But this Rand is simply an irreverent and sacrilegious rascal, who, if he received his deserts, should have been tarred and feathered. It is stated as a fact that this man, in conjunction with the Davenports, committed a solemn deposition *on oath* to the verity of this miraculous deliverance, on the narrative that they were imprisoned in the common jail, in the city of Oswego, New York, "*on account of propagating* OUR RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES!" Religious principles! Why, if their own story were true—if it were not as pitiful a falsehood as was ever coined by three illiterate and brazen-faced impostors—it proves that they had far less sense of religion than the most benighted African who worships his clumsy fetish: for *he* has at least some dim faith in the divinity of Mumbo-Jumbo, while the others implicitly obeyed the dictation of the ghost of a murderous pirate! Oaths indeed! Oaths are the last resource of crawling imitators, whose credit is so utterly bankrupt that no one will put faith in their assertion. There is something in the sublime audacity of the perjuries of Titus Oates and Bedloe, the original hatchers of a plot, which redeems them from entire oblivion; but for secondary scoundrels, such as Dangerfield and Everett, no man can entertain any other feeling than perfect loathing and contempt. We shall not so far dishonor the names of Barnum and Lyman as to place them in the same category with those of the Davenports and Rand.

But Saint Peter is not the only apostle whom the Davenports affect to rival. They claim to have been, on one occasion at least, miraculously transported through the air, in imitation, we presume, of Saint Philip. We feel a positive reluctance in obtruding such impious nonsense on our readers, but the rage for spiritualistic excitement has become so prevalent that exposure is an absolute duty; and we feel assured that a statement of the actual pretensions of these mountebanks will open the eyes of many who have been bewildered by the

exhibitions of their jugglery. Come we then to the miraculous translation, merely premising that at this time the familiar spirit of the Davenports answered to the name of "John King," and had desired Davenport senior to send his sons away from Buffalo, because it was dangerous for them to stay there, and they were needed elsewhere.—But old Davenport, though a believer in the spirits, had no idea of incurring any extra expense. He thought, reasonably enough, that the spirits who insisted on the journey might contrive the means to defray the charges. Not one stiver would he advance; so there was dissension between the seer and the invisible world. Let us again recur to the pages of the gentleman who has assumed the office of Plutarch:—

"The strange event which took place as the result, apparently, of this conversation, is variously vouched for; but I have preferred to take the facts from the lips of Mr. Ira Davenport, the elder of the two brothers. He says that he was walking one evening, at about nine o'clock, in the streets of Buffalo with his brother William, this being the winter of 1853–4, and the boys in their twelfth and fourteenth years.

"Here Ira's recollection ceases. The next thing he knew was that he found himself and his brother in a snow-bank, in a field, with no tracks near him, near his grandfather's house, at Mayville, Chautauque county, New York, *sixty miles from* Buffalo. On waking up William, who had returned to consciousness, they made their way to their grandfather's house, where they were received with surprise, and their story heard with astonishment. Their father was immediately informed by telegraph of their safety and whereabouts; and he, good obstinate man, set himself to find out how they got to Mayville. On inquiry, he found that no railway train could have taken them after the hour they left home more than a portion of the distance, and the conductors on the road knew the boys and had not seen them. 'John' declared, through the trumpet, after their return home, that he had transported them, or caused them to be transported, simply to show Mr. Davenport that they could be taken to any distance as easily as they could be carried about the room, and to show him that it was useless for him to try to keep them in Buffalo."

Having discovered this cheap mode of locomotion, we are rather surprised to find that the Bounding Brothers did not succeed in persuading "John King" or "Henry Morgan" to effect a considerable saving in the expenditure both of time and money, by wafting them through the air from New York to Liverpool, instead of allowing them to perform the usual transit by steamer. Often have we regretted the disappearance—past all hope of recovery—of the wonderful seven-leagued boots, last worn by the lamented Peter Schlemil.—Often have we sighed for a loan of that flexible carpet, gifted whilome by the Fairy Paribanou to her princely lover, seated on which you could be wafted, by the mere formation of a wish, as luxuriously as

though you were reclining on an imperial divan, from Astracan to Serendib, or from royal Bagdad to the distant island of Taprobane.—These were the aspirations of our boyhood—fondly cherished, and reluctantly abandoned, when a more intimate knowledge of the practical world forced upon us the painful conviction that we were doomed to wander outside of the gorgeous realms of enchantment. Now, however, thanks to the spiritualists, the old faith is reviving in our bosom—there is at all events a possibility that our early aspirations may be realized. Could we but persuade some spirit whose terrestrial career resembled those of John King or Henry Morgan—let us say, for example, Dick Turpin, David Haggart, Courvoisier, or Franz Muller—to take a posthumous interest in our welfare, we might be whisked, like those Davenports, from one region to another, put a girdle round the earth in less than forty minutes, and be forevermore independent and free from the exactions of railway fares, and the impositions of the thousand vagabonds who beset travelers by land and sea.

As, however, the Bounding Brothers crossed the Atlantic in the ordinary prosaic manner, we conjecture that they were induced on that occasion to waive their miraculous privilege, in consideration of the lesser spiritual attainments of the gentlemen who were their traveling companions. It would appear that by this time they had parted company with Rand. That was a prudent step, for no British audience, however gullible, would have tolerated for half an hour the impieties of that scandolous Yankee. We quote from Plutarch Nichols the account of the new staff associated with the interesting magicians:—

"The Brothers Davenport embarked from the city of New York on the 27th of August, 1864, bringing with them, in consequence of a nervous disability in Mr. William Davenport, a reinforcement in Mr. William H. Fay, who is not to be confounded with one H. Melville Fay—said, upon I know not what kind of authority, to have been detected in attempting to produce similar manifestations, or what might pass for them, in Canada. They were accompanied by Mr. Palmer, widely known as an *impressario* or business manager in the operatic and dramatic world, to whom, as an experienced agent, was confided the business and pecuniary portion of their undertaking—a matter of such obvious necessity that it needs neither apology nor explanation. To these was added Mr. J. B. Ferguson, a gentleman of education and position, formerly a clergyman of Nashville, the capital of Tennessee. Mr. Ferguson was born in the valley of Virginia, but emigrated early in life west of the Alleghenies. He is now forty years old, and is greatly esteemed by those who know him best as a man of integrity and honor, of high religious principle, purity of character, deep thought, and eloquent expression."

In other words, Fay was the accomplice, Palmer the money-taker,

and Ferguson the showman and lecturer of the spiritualistic missionary menagerie.

Judging from his own statement, which is printed in the volume before us, this Ferguson is by no means so odious a personage as Rand. He has sense or decency enough to avoid direct allusion to the Christian miracles, and obtrudes none of those impieties which, in the mouth of Rand, were so inexpressibly revolting. He rather affects the obscure metaphysical style, which gives an appearance of great profundity to his discourse, though in reality it is mere verbiage, without a single definite idea. Nevertheless he is, after a certain fashion, an adept at this kind of jargon, which is received with immense approbation by the frequenters of popular institutes. The following lucid exposition of the nature of spiritual manifestations might excite the envy of many an itinerant lecturer:—

"The evidences of intelligence, of wisdom, of prophetic information and warning, of insight as to events which are yet to occur, and which always do occur when thus foretold—the protection and guidance and care unfailing attending the mission of these men and all who are connected it, are to me equally powerful and convincing evidences as the manifestations of force or power. I do not undervalue those evidences of power that shock the materialist into belief. I know what immortality is worth as a motive to man in producing a living hope, and I know that these evidences are evidences of hope to all—yes, one mighty all—despite all the denials, vain attempts at explanation, and seeming misapplication, that a diversified appreciation and culture may make of them. I know they are true, and will outlive all our standards of adaptation and application. I know they reveal the Godlike in man. I know they are the culmination of all the movements, of all the nations, tribes, and peoples of a common humanity. I know they reveal a unity in all human diversity. They will go on in increasing power, as our race and age shall unfold to receive them. They will stay the desolating hand of selfish and sectarian animosity. They will lay low the vain conceptions of those who seek not beyond the gratification of personal desire and self-aggrandizement. They will assure us that God loves us all; and as spirit is above form, right above wrong, so will they rise above the murky mire and clodded earth which too often weigh us down beneath all that would adorn and beautify man as one and undivided in the Spirit that gives him life and destiny. However faint the scintilations, they come as the sparkling gems of thought divine to illumine the midnight of human erring, and they make us know that there is no hour so auspicious with hope, no day so bright, no achievements so good, but that its equal will come to each, and bring the conscious reflection that through the deepest penury and want, and the most trying scenes of human care and responsibility, we are ever ascending, under the mighty hand of progress that spans all time, to a good no language can either express or measure, under the benign reflection of the evidences of a hope to man universal, which are so signally marking our age or time."

What think ye of that, my masters? Are not these the utterances of divine philosophy, clear, consoling, and elevating? So purely fascinated are we by the fervid eloquence and marvelous rhetoric of Ferguson, that we are tempted to throw aside all previous convictions and beliefs, and become his willing pupil.

"Know that your words have won me at the last
To practice magic and concealed arts.
Philosophy is odious and obscure;
Both law and physic are for petty wits;
'Tis magic, magic, that hath ravished me!
How am I glutted with conceit of this!
Shall I make spirits fetch me what I please?
Resolve me of all ambiguities?
Perform what desperate enterprise I will?
I'll have them fly to India for gold,
Ransack the ocean for orient pearl,
And search all corners of the new-found world
For pleasant fruits and princely delicates.
I'll have them read me strange philosophy,
And tell me secrets of all foreign kings."

Yet, upon second thought, and a calm examination of the evidence before us, we doubt whether, if indeed we should become as intimate with the Spirits, and enjoy their protection in the same manner as the Yankee Bounding Brothers, the results would altogether correspond with the inflamed anticipations of Faustus. For we are nowhere informed that enchanted banquets are spread for the Messrs. Davenport by the agency of their disembodied retainers, "John King" and "Henry Morgan." If these fine Ariels do indeed present themselves at the social suppers which follow the fatigues of the *seances*, it must be rather to participate in the kidneys, stout, and gin and-water, than to fetch pomegranates from the south. Whatever knowledge they may have of buried treasures has not been communicated to the Davenports; nor, for the benefit of their protoges, have they rifled Golconda of its gems, or plucked the pearl from the oyster of the Indian seas.—What then is the amount of their agency and performance? Simply this: They untie in a close cabinet the cords wherewith the limbs of the Davenports are bound—they put a coat upon the back of Mr. Fay when his hands are tied—they jingle the tambourine, strike the guitar, and make those instruments whisk about a darkened room—they pinch the knees of the spectators, and shove spectral hands out of holes in the cabinet. That is the sum and total of their whole performance!

If modern magic can do no more than this, we are forced to the conclusion that the spirits now actively at work are vastly inferior to

those who condescended in the reign of King James to give instruc tions to the witches. "Henry Morgan" is a weak, driveling, and contemptible Spirit—a most puling and lubberly Kobold—in comparison with "Tom Reid," who, twenty-nine years after his decease on the field of Pinkie, appeared to Bessie Dunlap of Lime, in the form of "ane honest, weel, elderly man, gray-beardit, and had ane grey coat with Lombard sleeves of the auld fashion; ane pair of grey breeks, and white shanks gartered aboon the knee; ane black bonnet on his head, close behind and plain before, with silken laces drawn through the lips thereof; and one white wand in his hand." "Tom" was something like a familiar Spirit, for with great gallantry he proposed to Bessie Dunlap to elope with him to Fairyland, and actually introduced her to a select circle of fairies. Pitiful beyond comparison is "John King"—a shamefaced disembodied dunce, whose highest effort of genius is to pinch the leg of some gasping Cockney in the dark—when placed beside the "very mickle, black, rough man" who consorted with Isobel Gowdie, and took her on one occasion to the Downie Hills, where, said Isobel, "I got meat from the Queen of Faerie, more than I could eat. The King of Faerie is a braw man, weel-favored, and broad-faced. There were elf-bulls routing and skoiling up and down there, and affrighted me." These old Spirits were worth knowing, for by following their directions the witches could be transformed into hares. For their own credit, King and Morgan ought to take the hint, and metamorphose the Davenports into tom-cats.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

[From the American Christian Review.]

DO WE NEED A THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL?

This question is now occupying a few minds and deeply interesting them, while a vast number is not thinking much about it. Those favorable to a theological school are much exercised on the question and deeply solicitous. They are pressing the matter on every occasion where opportunity serves. Many seem to speak of it as an unquestionable necessity, so clearly so, as hardly to admit of argument. They intimate that no one can hold the necessity for it in doubt, unless he be some stupid ignoramus, or dolt. But the question, whether we need a theological school, has not been discussed yet, among us, to any considerable extent. The brotherhood have not thought much on the question, and anything claiming so much importance as the inauguration of an entirely new kind of school, is not to be received without investigation. We belong to the class, no matter

whether it be large or small, who have no use for a theological school. In our humble opinion, it would be a fifth wheel. While we speak thus distinctly, we are open to conviction and ready to hear the finest arguments in favor of it, but not ready to receive it without argument, clear, strong and conclusive. When we shall be convinced that the cause demands it; that the Lord will be pleased with it; that it is right, we shall be happy to aid it according to our ability.

The main difficulty apprehended, in investigating the question, is to define and keep defined the proper issue. The question then, is not whether we shall educate men to preach, or for every department. The proposition that preachers should be educated—that all should be educated—public and private men and women too, is unquestionably true. A man not favorable to education, in its fullest and broadest sense, for all classes, is behind the times. Certainly, then, preachers should be educated, as well educated as possible. So far as we are concerned, no one need offer an argument to prove the necessity and importance of education for all as far as possible to diffuse it.—This is all granted. But this may all be granted and all that can be said on this point, and then nothing said favorable to a theological school. There still may be no necessity for such a school, as we most sincerely believe to be the true state of the case.

Does the reader inquire how we are to educate men for the ministry? The answer is, precisely as we educate men, or women, for anything else; in the common schools, the seminaries, colleges and universities. What has been the main plea on which the money has been obtained to build our colleges? Has it not been that these colleges were to educate men to preach the gospel? Every man knows that this was the plea, the great plea. This plea was proper; the colleges are doing this work and much more; they are educating all who attend. This is all right. These colleges are now accessible to our young men, and the way is thus opened for them to obtain a liberal education.

But the reply will be made, that the colleges do not *make preachers* —that many pass through college and still are *not preachers*—and *cannot preach.* That is all true, and what intelligent men knew would be the case all the time. The college *educates*, no matter whether for preachers, for lawyers, doctors, merchants or farmers; but makes no preachers, lawyers, doctors, merchants or farmers. Educating a man is one thing, and making a preacher of him is another. If he has the capacity, and will perform the labor required in college, the college will educate him, but will not and cannot make him a preacher. He may be a preacher before he is educated, or may become one after he is educated; but the education imparted in college, or all

that can be imparted in college, does not and, in the nature of the case, cannot make a preacher.

Does some one reply;—That is all true, but we want the theological school to take the young man after he has gone through his collegiate course, and make him a preacher? Then you do not want the theological school to *educate* the young man, but to *make a preacher* of him after he is educated! You do not want the theological school to teach the languages, for these are taught in the colleges. In the college you have a chair devoted to languages. All that pertains to good public speaking, rhetoric, elocution, gestures, &c., &c., is taught, and properly taught, in the colleges. Logic, grammar, oomposition, &c. &c., are taught in the colleges. All this pertains to *education*, but does not make a preacher. A man may have gone through it all and acquitted himself well, as thousands have done, and not be a preacher; or a man may be a preacher and not have gone through it. It is of much value to him that he has accomplished himself in these departments, no matter what profession he may desire to enter; but having gone regularly through the collegiate course, only educates a man, without making him a doctor, lawyer, or preacher. The preacher is yet to be made. The young man has obtained a liberal English education, studies the languages, logic, rhetoric, elocution, &, &., but is now only ready to commence the work of making a preacher.

Precisely so, exclaims the advocate of the theological school, and now he is ready to enter the theological school, and there be made a preacher. But that is precisely what *cannot be done there*. The theological school may make a doctor of divinity, as the college does a master of arts, but that is not making a *preacher of the gospel*. What is to be done in the the theological school? You reply, study the Bible. Certainly a man must study the Bible before he can preach successfully, but if he cannot study the Bible, after he is educated, without a theological school, he will never make a preacher. "Study history," you say; but of what use is a theological school to the man studying history? But after you have drilled him for three years in the college, then in the theological school three years more, he comes out with an enfeebled constitution and no preacher yet! He must commence learning to preach! There is a long chapter before him yet, and a more difficult one than he has passed through. He may have succeeded well in literature, languages, arts, sciences; the study of the Bible, history, &c., &c.; but there is the extended volume, human nature, men and things, the world, as it is, and with which he has now to deal; which has never been opened to him yet. This department cannot be learned in colleges, nor in theological schools. It cannot be learned from books. It must be exhibited to the eye, the

ear; mingled in the very life of the student, and become a part of his experience, before he can know it. He must mingle with the world, study it, learn it, and, by active efforts, learn how to operate on it. A man not qualified in this department, will never make a successful preacher, nor in any sense a profitable one.

The college may educate and qualfy a man to use the books and acquire knowledge; to study the Bible, interpret, criticise and evan translate; and this man may go on in his studies, acquire the most extended knowledge of books and all that can be learned in schools and still be no preacher. How to embody his knowledge into discourses, present it in an attractive and forcible manner, so as to move the world, is yet to be learned. This cannot be learned in colleges, theological schools, or books. This can only be learned in the field. He can no more learn this in theological schools, than boys can learn to plow, reap and thresh in an agricultural school. The man who teaches young men to preach, is not to be housed in a theological school, any more than the man who would teach his sons plowing, planting, sowing, reaping, threshing, &c., &c., is to do it in an agricultural school. He must go out into the field and work with the young men, and show them how to work, not only *by example* show them how the work is done, but at the same time give them examples of piety, devotion, zeal, energy, industry and self-sacrifice. This is the only way in which we can raise up a class of young men that will have the industry, the perseverence and endurance to go out and do the work. They must have examples of industry, enterprise, perseverence, endurance, to go out through the the world, penetrate sll the nooks and corners of the land, gather the people, and bring them to the Lord.

What we need, is to sustain our colleges well; do all in our power to educate all as far as possible; raise an educational fund to aid young men who desire to preach, whose education is insufficient without regard to any one college, and let the young men and their more immediate friends determine what college they shall enter. As soon as these young men leave the college, let them enter the field, if they can do so, under the direction of some experienced preacher, in whom they have confidence, read the Bible and history, write and study, five hours every morning; preaching from one to two discourses each day, and they will soon make preachers, and preachers too, worth something when they are made. It is not the amount a man *knows* that blesses the world, but the amount that he *does*. We want the men who have the knowledge and will do the work. We desire our young men to have sufficient education, but in addition to that, to go out into the field, mingle with the people, become *of the*

people; learn the people, the world, and how to to battle for righteousness and truth; and they will become effective, energetic and powerful men. They will make the world know that they are in it. With them it will not be *all pay* and *no work*; nor *all work* and *no pay*; but *good work* and *good pay*. But if you desire to fill the country with a set of drones, withot energy, life or animation, who can never be *paid enough*, nor *do little enough work*; who expeet to live in the finest places and be honored with the first positions, not for anything they do, but because they are wise and great, establish ecclesiastical machinery to manufacture and furnish them to order. If you want men to rule you with a rod of iron, and to teach you that you know nothing and are nobody; that you should have no voice in these matters, or anything to do with them, except to furnish the money, then go for theological schools, and they will soon furnish the men you want. We want to go for all that is good, but for nothing that is not good. Come up, brethren, and examine the subject.

REMARKS.

The foregoing is from the pen of Bro. Franklin. It takes advantage of what we may call a reformation-prejudice against "theological schools," to oppose what is daily felt to be a growing want among us, and what we should properly denominate *ministerial education*.—Bro. Franklin is a great friend of education, in the classical and scientific sense of that term. This he has proved both by his pen and his pecuniary contributions to our colleges. He is in favor, too, of "educating men to preach," and in answer to the supposed question, "How to educate men for the ministry," responds, very correctly we think, "Precisely as we educate men and women for anything else; in the common schools, the seminaries, colleges and universities." This is unquestionably a correct answer; but how does Bro. Franklin apply it? Let me ask, How do we educate a man for a physician? Does the ordinary literary and scientific course of our colleges fit any one for the practice of medicine? Surely not. How do we educate one for the Law? Will a full course in Latin and Greek, science, logic, rhetoric, &c., prepare him for admission to the bar, and the successful practice of the law? Will any one affirm this? Surely not. We agree that we must educate men for the ministry precisely as we educate men and women for anything else, but we do not admit that any one is educated for any particular life or labor, by simply passing through the ordinary college course. In every thing else, besides this college course, which should be a common preparation as far as possible for all professions, there is a special training and instruction for

each. We have medical schools for physicians; we have law schools for lawyers; we have normal schools for teachers; and laboratory instruction for chemists; and yet, though Bro. Franklin admits that we must educate men for the ministry precisely as we educate them for these and other things, he stumbles over his prejudice against theological schools, when he comes to apply the rule to preachers, and virtually denies that men are to be educated as ministers at all, so far as schools can do it.

He says, we "do not want the theological school to *educate* the young man, but to *make a preacher* of him after he is educated."—Bro. Franklin seems to have discovered some very cunning distinction between *educating* a young man and *making a preacher* of him! But we cannot see it. So far as it is proper to speak of *making a preacher* at all, the process is one of education. The ordinary college course is a process of *general* education; the after work of training a young man for the ministry, is only a continuation of his education in a further and special direction. The difference is not between *educating* a young man and *making a preacher* of him—but between a *general* education and a *special* one.

After all, Bro. Franklin believes in *making preachers*, but he has his own way of doing it; and so far as it goes, it is a very good way. Bro. Franklin, I presume, would not be surprised if it should occur to me, or any one else, that he himself would be a very capital professor of the sort of theological school which he advocates. He says, "The man who teaches young men to preach, is not to be housed in a theological school. * * * He must go out into the field, and work with the young men, and show them how to work; not only *by example* show them how the work is done, but at the same time give them examples of piety, devotion, zeal, energy, industry, and self-sacrifice." Now it would be a very interesting spectacle to see Bro. Franklin, or any one else if he prefers, as a model peripatetic professor of the art of preacher-making, traveling the round of his appointments with a class of twenty or thirty young candidates for the degree of M. D. V. trooping at his heels, taking notes of his piety, devotion, zeal, industry and self-sacrifice, seeing how the work is done, and gradually being made into preachers! It would be a little annoying, doubtless, to small villages to entertain these strangers, and might severely test their readiness to obey that injunction which makes it our duty to be hospitable to such, and also in some cases hinder a little the Professor's popularity as an Evangelist, and curtail in some small moiety the number of calls for his valuable services; but still, the importance of showing off the examples of piety, &c., might overcome all this, and "enterprise, perseverance and endu-

rance" succeed at last in "penetrating all the nooks and corners of the land."

Bro. Franklin is a man of eminently practical good sense, and while a few preachers among us might succeed in getting one or two young candidates to accompany them on their preaching tours, and through this means initiate them into much that might be useful to them in their calling, yet I am sure he cannot for a moment suppose that such a success would be equal to the measure of the present demand for an educated ministry. According to this scheme, as soon as the young man leaves the college, he is "to enter the field, if he can do so, under the direction of some experienced preacher, in whom he has confidence, read the Bible and history, write and study, five hours every morning—preaching from one to two discourses each day—and they will soon make preachers, and preachers too worth something when they are made." In this scheme there is a fatal 'if,' to begin with. The "if he can do so" presents the first and, nine times in ten, the insurmountable difficulty. How many young men who have just left college, could be thus accommodated with a special traveling professor of homiletics, in whom they could have the confidence that a pupil should always feel in his teacher? Again, Who that has had any experience in teaching, can for a moment believe that the programme of study proposed could be carried out with any degree of success? Study five hours in the morning, while hurrying around with an itinerating evangelist, in the midst of company all the while, in most cases with no means of retiracy, and perpetually interrupted by change of place and confused by the perplexities of private family arrangements, who could do it? Then to preach once or twice every day! Why the "experienced preacher" himself can only get the audience once a day during the week, and of course he would not give the hour to his pupil. And what if the "experienced preacher" should have a large class with him—some fifteen or twenty preacher-students—does Brother Franklin see how the scheme would work! Where will they find audiences for two discourses a day each!

We ask Bro. Franklin to reconsider this matter. His article has evidently been written in haste, and a question like this is not to be understood or disposed of in this way. The kind of preacher that Bro. Franklin wishes to be made, is all well enough; but the method by which he proposes to make them, is surely inadequate. Let it be understood that it is about the method of meeting this demand that we are inquiring. We all want the preachers—we all agree that they need a special education; Bro. Franklin thinks that this special education and training can be best imparted in the method to which we have just been objecting; others think that we need special schools

for the purpose. I confess myself to belong to this latter class. Let us have, we say, a school for training and qualifying young men for the work of the ministry. Bro. Franklin may seek to excite prejudice against such a provision by calling it a "Theological School." But any one can see that his traveling professor could become as much a teacher of Theology as if he were "housed up in a school." But the school we want is one for imparting all that a school can impart to fit a preacher for the great practical duties that will devolve upon him as a public minister of the gospel. Theology as a science covers but a part of this preparation. The practical duties of pastoral life, instruction, training, and practice in the composition and delivery of sermons, with all that is involved in the discharge of pulpit and congregational ministrations, whether as an evangelist or an elder, together with constant critical study in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, with exercises in translation, and such collateral studies in History, &c., as elucidate the Word of God and qualify one for its profitable and practical use in the pulpit—these are all important ends to be aimed at in such a school, and towards which, any one of even moderate reflection can see, that more can be doue in one year in a school specially designed for the purpose, than in half a life time in the loose and irregular way proposed by Brother Franklin.

We are well aware that there is a training, which nothing but real field-experience can give, and of course this is to be learned only by experience. We do not propose to furnish a school for imparting this, neither do we admit that it can be furnished by the experience of a travelling trainer of preachers. What we propose however is to so qualify one by previous instruction and training, that when these lessons of experience come, he will be able readily and wisely to adjust himself to them and turn them to good account for the future. A general may be ever so well educated and trained in the military school, yet he finds there is much for him to learn, when he comes to command armies in the field. But how readily does he learn these lessons, and turn what would confuse and confouud another, into profit and success.

We hope that the great practical duty of providing a necessary and sensible course of instruction for our ministers will not be confounded with any prejudice that may exist against "Theological Schools," but that men like Bro. Franklin who love the truth and have done so much to make our cause what it is, will all come to think alike on this subject, and lend their powerful and needed aid to furthur so great and necessary a work for the future success and further triumph of our cause. Let us take counsel together like brethren, and agree to do what is best for this end. If brother Frank-

lin can convince me that his plan will answer the purpose, in which we are both agreed, I pledge myself most cordially to adopt it. On the contrary if he cannot do so, I ask him then to look with candor and fairness upon what we propose, and if he can do so in harmony with his better judgment, to lend us the powerfulc o-operation of his pen and tongue in pesuading the brethren to look ahead and provide a means for furnishing the churches and the world with an adequate and competent ministry. W. K. P.

CHRIST DIVINE.

Come now, all ye that tell us in your wisdom of the mere natural humanity of Jesus, and help us to find out how it is that he is only a natural development of the human. Select your best and wisest character; take the range, if you will, of all the great philosophers and saints, and choose out one that is most competent; or if, perchance some one of you may imagine that he is himself about on a level with Jesus, (as we hear that some of you do,) let him come forward in this trial and say, "Follow me!" "Be worthy of me!" "I am the life of the world!" "Ye are from beneath, I am from above!" "Behold a greater than Solomon is here!" take on all these transcendent assumptions, and see how soon your glory will be sifted out of you by the detective gaze and darkened by the contempt of mankind! Why not! Is not the challenge fair! Do you not tell us that you can say as divine things as he? Is it not in you, too, of course, to do what is human? Are you not in the front rank of human development? Do you not rejoice in the power to rectify many mistakes and errors in the words of Jesus. Give us, then, this one experiment, and see if it does not prove to you a truth that is of some consequence: viz., that you are a man, and that Jesus Christ is—more. —*Dr. Bushnell.*

Saint Columbus.—It is said that the Pope intends to canonize Christopher Columbus, as the instrument chosen by heaven for the salvation of a whole hemisphere. His relics are in the cathedral at Havana.

The *Christian Enquirer* (Unitarian) announces that the subscription of $20,000 for the endowment of a professorship in Antioch College, to be called the "Bellows Professorship," is now complete. It publishes the list of subscriptions.

FOREKNOWLEDGE AND FREE WILL.

Bro. W. K. Pendleton:—The Harbinger for May contains your reply to my difficulty concerning the changes and imperfections of human language, translations, etc. There is a point or two which you did not render as clear as I could have wished; but in the main, it is an entirely satisfatory solution—so much so, that I feel amply repaid, and am more than thankful to you for the attention you have bestowed on the subject. There is still another difficulty, which I have to encounter in my investigations, concerning which I have thought much; and one, too, which pesters me not a little. If you will indulge me, I will make it known to you in as concise a manner as I know how.

The difficulty or obstacle which lies in my way, is in reference to God's foreknowledge, as it relates to man's free will. I have ever been unable to reconcile the predictions of the Bible, with the doctrine of the free moral agency of man; which doctrine I regard as a "most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort."

Take an example or two from the New Testament: "And as they [the disciples] did eat, he [Christ] said: Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me." He then quotes the prophet: "The Son of man goeth, as it is written of him, but wo unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man, if he had not been born." He even specifies his betrayer, viz: Judas Iscariot. Here we find the Christ stating most positively that a certain individual should do a certain thing, or perform a certain act.—We also find, by consulting the next chapter, that this very identical person *did* perform the very identical act, which the Christ said he *should* perform, thus fulfilling his prediction. Yet, the Savior anathamatizes Iscariot almost *ad infinitum*, saying, "*It had been good for that man if he had not been born!*" Considering Judas to have been a *free agent*, suppose he had chosen not to commit such a foul deed as to betray "innocent blood"—what then? Why, Christ would have been proven to be a *false prophet!!*

Again: Not long prior to his crucifixion, Christ said to his disciples: "You know that after two days is the passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified." But you may say, it was not *decreed* that the "Son of man" should be taken and crucified. True enough, the passage just quoted does not state positively, that such *should* be the case, but we learn from it, that Jesus *foreknew* the whole circumstance, (it is said, in another place, that he knew all things that should come upon him,) and this, I opine, amounts to a decree; for what-

ever God foreknows, *must be so.* If he foreknows that I will do a certain thing, *I must do that thing;* there is no alternative. Otherwise, it would only prove that God (who is supposed to know *all* things) did not foreknow it! If he knows my future destiny, it is *unalterably fixed*—as much so as if it were in the past. Hence, the Jews, in slaying the Lord Jesus Christ, did precisely what had been, by implication, decreed that they should do, thus "fulfilling the Scriptures," as Jesus said. Yet, they are called "sinners," and condemned by the Apostle Peter, as *murderers!* Suppose thay had acted on the principle of free agency, and chose not to perpetrate such an atrocious crime as to murder the Lord of glory—what then? Why the Scriptures would not have been fulfilled—there would have been no blood shed "for the remission of sins!!"

I might instance other cases of the kind, but the two above cited will suffice. If you will be kind enough to afford me some light on the subject, I will wait with patience for your reply.

I subscribe myself your brother indeed, SINCERITY.

REPLY.

There must ever be difficulty to us in comprehending the action and co-operation of attributes that are *infinite* in their powers. The most we can do is to show that they are not *contradictory*—that the one does not logically demonstrate the other to be impossible. We must recognize this principle clearly in the outset, or we will find ourselves demanding what is rationally impossible, and therefore failing, of course, to come to a satisfactory conclusion. This question of the foreknowledge of God and the free agency of man has perplexed many minds. Some of the greatest and best have turned away from it as beyond the reach of human solution; and yet *practically*, it exerts but little influence upon the enlightened Christian mind of our age: I say *practically*, for while few, very few perhaps, find any satisfactory explanation, upon philosophical or metaphysical grounds, the large majority of mankind rest assured in the consciousness of freedom, which is the universal assertion of the *practical reason*, and may be said to be an integral part of our humanity, since none are without it; and are content to regulate their actions by a sense of responsibility which is universally felt in the moral nature, and without which law and duty could have no authority and force, save that of physical power and brute fear. Give a man the consciousness of freedom, (and this *is given* to all men,) and the sense of responsibility in his moral nature, (and this too all men have,) and it will make but little difference with him whether he can reconcile these admitted truths with some others or not; they will and must give direction to

his life, and determine his daily action in the moral universe of which he is a member.

Whilst we do not regard this question, then, as one of very wide *practical* interest, still, to the more thoughtful and profoundly speculative intellect, it is one which, from its very difficulty, must ever excite the keenest exercise of our powers. No man who thinks profoundly upon the great questions which must ever be encountered in meditation upon the attributes of God and the nature and powers of the human mind, can fail to encounter it, in almost every discursion which his intellect may take into these inviting regions. We do not know that what we have reached in this direction will be satisfactory to others. We do not expect and ought not not to claim, that, in a region so purely speculative as this, the special solution of any one mind should be made the faith or opinion of others. All that we can do is to show such light as we ourselvess see by, and if it suit not other eyes, leave them to find out something better.

Before we adventure into these regions, let us be sure of two things: First, *That God does foreknow all things;* Second, *That man is free.* These are the propositions to be reconciled. If they are not both true, then it is useless to waste time in attempting to reconcile them; and from this is suggested the following caveat: Take care that, if we fail to reconcile two admitted truths, we do not conclude therefore, that one of them is not true. Each of these propositions is admitted to be true, upon grounds which are independent and perfectly satisfactory. They stand, each upon its own foundation. Taking them thus as we find them, we raise the question about them, "Can they be reconciled?" We set ourselves to solve this problem and fail—and because of this failure, conclude that one of these propositions is not true. Now what is the fallacy here? Only this: We have made our power to reconcile truths the test of truth itself. This is very absurd—as is illustrated in a thousand examples of the plainest science every day. Take a man who is ignorant of Chemistry, and show him Oxygen and Hydrogen. You satisfy him in a thousand ways that they are real material gases. He admits the fact. You exhibit to his eye a given quantity of these in the closed end of a glass tube, above a column of water. You next affirm the doctrine of the indestructibility of matter. You satisfy him that the annihilation of matter is a thing inconceivable by the human mind. He admits the proposition. Now here are two propositions—one asserting a fact—that is, the actual, real, material presence, in a given space, to the exclusion of all other matter, of a given quantity of Oxygen and Hydrogen. We have measured them, weighed them, mixed them, and marked the space which they occupy. The other is, that this

Oxygen and Hydrogen are incapable of annihilation. But whilst the mind is resting in this knowledge, the chemist adroitly passes a spark of electricity through the mixed gases—and in an instant they are gone. Now arises the question, "How are we to reconcile the admitted propositions in this case?" The chemist knows very well how to do it—but the man ignorant of Chemistry finds it utterly beyond his power to do so. He does not know that electricity has the power of so uniting these gases as to convert them into water—and therefore cannot solve the difficulty. But how absurd would it be for him, because he cannot reconcile his propositions, to conclude that therefore one of them is false!

This is precisely the error into which many persons run in their failures to satisfactorily reconcile the doctrine of free agency in man with the doctrine of the foreknowledge of God. Let us remember, therefore, that these propositions rest on their own evidence, and are not dependent in any sense upon our ability to reconcile them with one another; and then, when we indulge in speculations concerning their harmony, we shall be in no danger of running into skepticism about them, because of our ignorance or want of the speculative acumen and insight which are necessary to reconcile their action and co-operation in the economy of the divine government.

When we raise a *philosophical* difficulty, we must be content with a philosophical *solution* of that difficulty. First, then, we lay down the proposition, *That the foreknowledge of any event does not necessarily involve any agency, on the part of him who foreknows, in the actual performance of that event.* I know perfectly well what happened in my presence an hour ago. One gifted with foreknowledge knows equally well what will happen in my presence an hour to come. My knowledge of what happened an hour ago came through my power to observe what actually transpired in my presence—*I saw it.* The knowledge which one gifted with foreknowledge has of that which shall happen an hour hence, comes also from his power to observe what is present to him—for the very conception of foreknowledge is, that the future is seen as the present. Now as the past event, of which I have perfect knowledge, because I saw it, was in no sense my act, or controlled by me—so the future event, of which he who is gifted with foreknowledge has perfect vision in advance, because he sees it as present, need not in any sense be his act, or controlled by him, who foresees it. Is not this philosophically clear? Foreknowledge only involves the concession, "That God knows perfectly well now, what men will do in the future." It does not involve the assumption that he *makes* them will to do that which he *foresees* they will do.—

To foreknow a human action and to compel one to perform that action, are surely very distinctly different propositions.

Let us apply this distinction to the case of Judas. Our Savior foreknew what Judas would do, and predicted it; but he did not compel him to do it. Judas was a free agent. As such he would act in every thing that he did. To men, these free acts would be known only as he did them; to Christ they were known before he did them. Those who saw Judas betray the Savior, when he actually did it, did not by this knowledge become the cause of his so acting. This knowl- of the act on their part did not destroy his free agency;—so the foreknowledge of this act by the Savior, did not make him in any sense the cause of his so acting, or interfere with his free agency in the deed. Suppose we modify our statement a little, and present it in this form: Our Savior not only foresaw what Judas would do, but foreknew that he would do it, not by any constraint, but by his own free will and accord. Is not this a rational proposition? and if so, must we not concede that if foreknowledge, in this case, determined the action, it, with equal authority, also determined the freedom of the agent in performing that action. Foreknowledge, then, is not irreconcilable with human freedom, since this very freedom itself may be as much the subject of foreknowledge, as the actions which we may perform in its exercise.

But you say, "Suppose Judas had not chosen to commit such a foul deed as to betray 'innocent blood'—what then? Why Christ would have been proven to be a false prophet." Precisely so—that is, it would have been demonstrated that Christ was not gifted with foreknowledge. But then this is contrary to the concession in the case, which is, that he possessed foreknowledge, and in consequence, predicted not falsely, but truly. If you show that he predicted falsely, then the answer is, that he did not foresee; if you show that he predicted truly, then the answer is, that he did truly foresee what Judas would freely choose to do:—only this and nothing more.

Again, you say, "If God knows my future destiny, it is *unalterably fixed*,—as much so as if it were in the past." We answer—Does not the doctrine of foreknowledge assert that, with God, the future is as the past? The future and the past are alike present to Him. Let us say that the past of your life is all known to me; does this knowledge of mine destroy your free agency, or relieve you of responsibility for what you have done? By no means. Let us say then that the future of your life is all known to God, as much as though it were past; does this foreknowledge of God destroy your free agency, or relieve you of responsibility for what you will hereafter do? Clearly the ases are precisely the same, so far as the law of morality which they

involve, is concerned. That God foreknows my destiny, cannot be denied; but that this foreknowledge destroys my free agency and relieves me of responsibility—this is by no means a logical consequence.

Foreknowledge is after all nothing but *knowledge*. Throw out the question of time—which we should remember is not really involved in the mind of God at all—and we shall be at once relieved of the whole obscurity which hangs so bewilderingly over this question.—Strictly speaking, we cannot speak of God's knowledge being *before* and *after* at all. These expressions are only proper when applied to the conditions of human knowledge. Throw out the question of time, then, which is involved in the prefix *fore*, and we may present our reasoning in the following syllogism:

The knowledge of a man's motives and actions does not destroy his free agency in performing them, or relieve him of responsibility for them;

The foreknowledge of God, as regards human conduct, is really no more than the knowledge of a man's motives and actions;

Therefore, the foreknowledge of God, as regards human conduct, does not destroy his free agency in his motives and actions, or relieve him of responsibility for them.

We would be pleased to pursue this question into a fuller analysis, but our space will not now permit. It brings us to the mysterious boundaries of the Infinite, and we must tread modestly, and keep carefully on our human side of the shadowy line. Beyond this we cannot hope to go in our present subjection to the flesh. Some things we must submit to the future, in hope, however, that on even these the day will come when a fuller light shall dawn, and we be made able to see more perfectly. W. K. P.

STICKING FOR TRIFLES.

The Rev. Dr. Heugh, of Scotland, had in his church an elder who was thoroughly orthodox about church music. This good and sensible, but somewhat dogged and immovable man, hated the repeating tones as a principal sin of his day. Whenever the precentor started one of them he bolted from his pew. He had his hat in one hand, and as he passed along the passage to the door, he planted a staff, which he held in the other, with more energy than was requisite for the object of firm walking, taking care to be at once audible and visible. This worthy elder became incurably ill, and Dr. Heugh was requested to visit him on his death-bed. He hoped to find all his

small captiousness dissipated by the near prospect of his departure. He asked the elder if there was anything in particular he would like to speak about. The reply was, "Yes; I would like to tell you what an earnest wish I have, like Hezekiah of old, to go up again to the House of the Lord. But I would be contented to go ONCE." Dr. Heugh asked him what made him so anxious for this single return to public worship. "Oh," he said, "I would like so much to testify once more against the iniquity of vain repititions."

BETHANY COLLEGE.

TWENTY-FOURTH ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT.

The twenty-fourth annual Commencement of Bethany College was held as usual on the 4th of July. The occasion was honored with a fine audience, and the exercises of the day afforded a rich treat to the friends of learning. The graduating class, though not large, was one of unusual promise. Five young gentlemen were presented with the degree of "Bachelor of Arts;" four of whom made addresses of great merit. The Latin Salutatory by Mr. J. Preston Player of Nashville, Tenn., had more of what we imagine as the old Roman style, than any address of the kind we have ever listened to. We have never heard the Latin language so well pronounced, or a speaker in this tongue give more evidence of thinking what he was saying, than was manifested on this occasion. He was followed by an English Salutatory from Mr. Jabez Hall of W. Va., full of fine thought and apt expressions, with an easy and graceful delivery, that indicated much practice in this great American accomplishment of public speaking. Next came Mr. J. L. Pinkerton of Ky., in a short address, which, for soundness of thought and practical pith and point, would have done credit to an older head. After him Mr. W. C. Dawson of Mo., closed with an elegant and classic valedictory. It was truly a polished work, cut from the true Parean and with the chisel of a Greek. Mr. Dawson's delivery lacks animation, but in the composition of his address, every sentence was stamped with the impress of genius and scholarship. All of these young gentlemen, except the first named, we understand, design to enter at once upon the duties of the Christian ministry.

Besides the regular speeches of the graduates, the two Literary Societies of the College were represented in public addresses by speakers elected by their respective members. Mr. M. L. Streator, of Pa., appeared as the representative of the American Literary Institute, and Mr. W. B. Higby, of Ohio, on the part of the Neotrophian So-

ciety. They both gave high promise, and worthily discharged the trust committed to them by the suffrage of their Societies. Besides this representation of these highly flourishing Societies, we take pleasure in noticing another which was given in celebration of their anniversaries on the day before. This afforded a fuller opportunity of displaying the varied exercises by which these organizations seek to develop the mental powers of their members. Declamations, essays, original orations, and debates, all entered into the programme, and were performed with a spirit, elegance and ability which deserve the highest praise. We notice particularly in the productions of the students of Bethany College a manliness of style, and maturity of mind, that is beyond the reach of most of our Western Colleges.—Everything has a masculine vigor and vim about it, that makes one feel that the students are destined to stand prominent in the ranks of men, and to fill high places in the fields of public usefulness. Whether students catch these features from the Professors or that the reputation of Bethany College attracts to her the higher class of minds, we cannot say, but we find that we are not alone in this impression, but that it is the common sentiment of the visitors.

We were gratified to learn that some valuable additions were made to the Board of Trustees, and that there is a fair promise of greatly increased patronage for the future. We trust it may be so, and that the friends of Bethany College will promptly rally to her support and make her in endowment as she is in merit, among the first Institutions of our country. Surely no institution among the great body of Christians to whom it belongs, has done so much for their cause or is entitled to so much of their confidence and liberality. She has passed, we learn, through severe trials, during the war, but wisdom, prudence and faith have brought her through with signs of a bright providence still befriending her, and her friends should step forward promptly and with gratitude to give the open hand of encouragement. Where are her Alumni? Let one who is not of their body assure them, that they cannot more highly honor themselves, than in doing double honor to their *Alma Mater*. Will they stand by in these times, when almost every newspaper astonishes us with the princely munificence of the liberal in behalf of Colleges and other benevolent institutions, and do nothing for this monument of the wisdom and foresight of the illustrious patriarch, whose venerable form yet lends dignity and grace to the classic groves of Bethany College? We cannot believe it. We feel sure that the day is not far off when her magnificent pile of Buildings will be finished—her library replenished, and her professorships all liberally and permanently endowed.

A Well Wisher.

NEW TRUSTEES OF BETHANY COLLEGE.

At the last annual meeting of the Board of Trustees of Bethany College, the following new members were unanimously elected: Dr. C. A. Buckbee, N. Y.; Ross Forward, Bateman Goe, James McGrew, Thomas W. Phillips, and L. P. Streator, of Pa.; A. W. Campbell Jr., and Dr. R. Richardson, of W. V.; H. K. Reynolds, O.; James Darsie, Ills.; Z. F. Smith, Ky.; John M. Lea, Tenn.

At the same meeting, it was determined to hold the Annual Commencement of the College hereafter on the last Thursday in June, instead of on the 4th of July, as heretofore. This change was induced by the fact that many members of the Board find it inconvenient or unpleasant to be absent from their homes on the day of national rejoicing.

The subject of completing the college building, and also of enlarging the endowment, was earnestly discussed by the Board, and Albert Allen, Dr. Jno. C. Campbell, R. M. Bishop, W. K. Pendleton and C. L. Loos were appointed a committee with discretionary powers to effect these ends.

Provision was also made to provide ample and satisfactory accommodations for the confidently anticpiated increase of students for the next session.

Persons wishing for information concerning the College, will address W. K. Pendleton, Vice President, or C. L. Loos, Secretary, Bethany, Brooke co., W. V.

PLEASANT HILL FEMALE ACADEMY.

We had the pleasure of attending the annual examination of this school, during the exercises of the last day. We have never witnessed greater evidence of successful and thorough teaching, than this examination afforded. A class of seventeen young ladies received the degree of "Mistress of Arts"—and a more intelligent and thoroughly trained class, we venture to affirm, has not been graduated by any other school in our western country, for many a year.

This Seminary enjoys a popularity that is almost oppressive. It was full to overflowing during the last session, and will doubtless be so during the next. The location is healthy, and removed from the fashion and extravagance of city life; the government is parental and kind; the course of instruction very varied and complete; the corps of instructors ample and competent; and the drill and teaching thorough, severe and laborious, to the utmost limit of the student's power of healthful endurance;—and with all these essential qualities of a first

class institution, no wonder that the Pleasant Hill Seminary is a great success. Persons wishing information concerning this school, will address the President, Mr. T. C. McKeever, West Middletown, Washington co. Pa. W. K. P.

INDIANA STATE MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

To the Brethren and Churches of Christ in Indiana:

Dear Brethren:—Before many setting suns, the hand of Time will mark the close of another year's labor—a year which has been full of interest to every lover of humanity and God. Dark clouds have been all about us, and torrents of tears have been moistening hundreds of new-made graves; but now the bow of peace stretches across our heavens, and friends are coming home to aid us in the great work of life.—The same Paternal Hand which feeds the ravens, has dispensed to *us* a vast amount of spiritual and temporal blessings, and in return for this we make appeal in behalf of our Indiana Mission. Our labors during the past year have been crowned with great success. Our approaching Anniversary incites us to ask you to remember well the following: We assemble at Indianapolis, at 2 P. M., on Tuesday, the 10th of October, for the purpose of recounting our labors, and speaking of the good things the Lord has done for us. We hope to see *every* congregation in the land represented. *Many* brethren from other States have promised to be here. In behalf of our brethren at Indianapolis, *who desire to see you*, we invite you. All of the railroads coming to the city, besides many others, will, no doubt, grant half-fare favors to all of those who come. The Toledo, Logansport and B. Railroad, and the Louisville and New Albany and C. Railroad, have *already* given us an assurance of such favor.

We desire to procure a complete and accurate account of our statistics. This is intelligence which we need, and will be interesting to *all*. We desire this for publication. Last year but partial reports came to hand. We *now* want *complete* reports from *every* congregation. Shall we have from every church an accurate statement, embracing *all* items specified in the blank, forwarded to us immediately at Indianapolis, Box 282?

We urge every Congregation and Sunday School to take up a collection on the second Lord's day of August and send it to us, with statistics. The Parent Society is *now* aiding Districts and Congregations in different parts of the State. Calls for help from all quarters reach our ears, and faithful men stand ready to go forth and sow the seed and reap the golden harvest now ripening for the sickle. Our expenses in conducting the operations of the State Society are considrable. To meet *all* we make this special appeal, and pray God it will not be in vain. We

hope to hear from *every* church. Make an effort for a *liberal* contribution—one worthy the cause of the Lord; give notice of a collection the previous Lord's day. No matter how small the offering, send it immediately, and you will be credited for it. No matter how large, it will be needed, and wisely used. And we ask you, brethren, when you make this offering, to remember us before God.

We trust that the second Lord's day of August will be remembered as a day of thanksgiving, prayer and sacrifice in behalf of our Mission, and that all the brethren may *so* aid us that our Mission may do still greater good. In behalf of the Board,

INDIANAPOLIS, IND. R. L. HOWE, Cor. Sec'y.

QUERIES.

1. If a brother, having been elected to the office of Elder, but not ordained, and having served in that capacity for four or five years, should not, in his daily walk and conversation—his intercourse with the world, and in the administration of his official duties—prove to be such as to satisfy these brethren, and is unwilling to resign, what would be the proper course to pursue with him? J.

ANS.—It is humiliating to think that such a case as this can arise in the Christian church. Clearly a man must possess certain qualifications in order to justify his being made an Elder in the first place, and of course his after conduct must exhibit these qualifications to justify his continuance in office. Such cases as that described in the query, we trust are very rare; but where they do occur, I should have no hesitation in advising a church to request him promptly to resign, and then if he would not do it, to proceed to a formal exclusion of him from office by vote of the congregation.

2. Why is it that Christian churches never sing the Doxologies—Praise Father, Son and Holy Ghost? INQUIRER.

ANS.—Simply because there is no example or precept for such a mode of address to the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures. The Scriptures never call upon us to do anything in the name of the Holy Spirit; nor is there a single example of the Holy Sprit being personally addressed, in all the writings of the New Testament. There are also sound theoretical reasons for the omission of the practice; but we need not state them in addition to the conclusive *facts* which we have just given.

W. K. P.

A NEW EDITION of the Christian Sunday School Hymn Book, revised and enlarged, for sale by H. S. BOSWORTH, 107 Main-st., Cin., O.

GOOD WORDS FROM OUR CORRESPONDENTS.

COLLAMER, O., June 26, 1865.

DEAR BROTHER PENDLETON:—I am just home from our general meeting in our missionary district. It was held in Thompson, Geauga co. The attendance was very large, and most orderly. Brethren Jones, Burns, Cooley, Lillie, and others in attendance.

Will you please mention in the Harbinger that there will be a yearly meeting in Ashtabula county, in the Town of Trumbull, THE 3rd LORD'S-DAY IN AUGUST, commencing Friday previous. A. S. HAYDEN.

BRO. PENDLETON:—Our yearly meeting for Portage co., O., has just closed this 26th of June. The brethren were much refreshed, and six persons made the good confession and were baptized into Christ. Three others came to unite with us on the one foundation of Apostles and prophets, Christ the corner-stone. To the Lord be the praise. A. B. G.

OBITUARIES.

BRO. PENDLETON:—Please give the following notice of the death of our beloved brother L. M. Lankford, a place in the Harbinger. Bro. Lankford was a descendant of the Randolph family, of Virginia; and was himself a man of considerable abilities and promise. He was immersed about the year 1848; and shortly after, turned his attention to the study of science and litelature in general, but particularly to the study of sacred literature and the Bible. He was for several years a student of Burrett College, then under the Presidency of Eld. W. D. Carns. He became himself a successful teacher; he was a devoted Christian, one of the best congregational singers, and bid fair to become an able and useful preacher. He was a kind father; and, in the language of Sister Lankford herself, "Never—never was there a better companion than he was."

Bro. Lankford moved to the State of Illinois, studied the Eclectic System of Medicine, attended one course of lectures in the Eclectic College, Cincinnati, and intended moving to that city to practice. But alas! on his return to Ill. he contracted Typhoid Fever, which terminated his earthly existence on Saturday, Nov. 12, 1864. He was about 37 years of age. His mortal remains will rest in Shawneetown, Ill., till the "resurrection of the just." Sister J. L. Lankford has returned with her children to Monroe co., Ky.; and that she may succeed in "bringing them up in the instruction and service of the Lord," is the prayer of her brother in the faith, ISAAC T. RENEAU.

Died, at his residence in Leedsville, Dutchess county, New York, May 12th, 1865, William A. Benton, aged nearly 77 years. He confessed Christ and was baptized in Sept., 1834, and for about thirty years, has presided over the weekly assemblies of a small band of Disciples who meet in his own house. A kind husband, father, neighbor and friend, and a faithful disciple of Christ, has gone to his reward. May the survivors ever keep in memory his counsels and instructions, his earnest exhortations to duty, and the calm trust with which he awaited the summons to depart from earth. H. M. B.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 36.] BETHANY, W. V., *SEPTEMBER*, 1865. [No. IX.

MODERN DEMONOLOGY.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 364.)

As the Bounding Brothers are the most recent spiritual exhibitors, we have given them the priority of notice; but, after all, they are small beer and sorry magicians in comparison with Daniel Douglas Home, the Cornelius Agrippa of the age, who has favored us with his own biography.

Mr. Home is a Scoto-Yankee, of mysterious extraction, who, born somewhere in the neighborhood of Edinburgh, was taken to America when about nine years of age. His mother "was a seer throughout her life. She had what is known in Scotland as the second-sight, and in many instances she saw things which were afterwards found to have occurred at a distance, just as she had described them." It is pleasant to be assured that the *deuteroscopia*, hitherto supposed to be peculiar to the natives of the Hebrides, is also indiginous to the suburban villages of Auld Reekie.

The initiatory experiences of Mr. Home were derived from spirit rapping, and he was also favored with visions of an exceedingly transcendental sort, having been, on one occasion at least *translated*, that is, separated from the body, after the manner of Hermotimus and Mohamet. He then began to exhibit as a *medium* with great success, his audiences being favored with messages from deceased friends, the exhibition of spectral hands, spontaneous performances on guitars, and accordions, whisking of handkerchiefs from the pockets, and the like playful demonstrations, such as might have been executed by the dis-

embodied spirits of Charley Bates or the Artful Dodger. How he was received on his first visit to London—how he went on the Continent, became a Roman Catholic, had an interview with the Pope, wooed and married a Russian lady—and how M. Alexandre Dumas, the immortal author of 'Monte Christo,' officiated as godfather at his marriage—may be learned by those who choose to consult his biography. One passage, however, is too remarkable to be omitted, and we give it without a single word of comment:—

"On the 26th April, old style, or 8th May according to our style, at seven in the evening, and as the snow was fast falling, our little boy was born at the town house, situate on the Gagarines Quay, in St. Petersburg, where we were still staying. A few hours after his birth, his mother, the nurse, and I heard for several hours the warbling of a bird as if singing over him. Also that night, and for two or three nights afterwards, a bright star like light, which was clearly visible from the partial darkness of the room, in which there was only a night lamp burning, appeared several times directly over its head, where it remained for moments, and then slowly moved in the direction of the door, where it disappeared. This was also seen by each of us at the same time. The light was more condensed than those which have been so often seen in my presence upon previous and subsequent occasions. It was brighter, and more distinctly globular. I do not believe that it came through my mediumship, but rather through that of the child, who has manifested on several occasions the presence of the gift."

The remainder of the passage, referring to certain obstetric demonstrations, we omit as ineffably indecent.

Hitherto Mr. Home, though beset by supernatural agencies had found no one historical spirit to act as his especial monitor. Faust still lacked his Mephistopheles. But in the course of the year 1850, Rand's pamphlet relating to the marvelous achievements of the Davenports was published; and the portion of it which excited the public curiosity was the account of the reappearance of "Henry Morgan the buccaneer." By a curious coincidence, no sooner did this work appear in England, than Mr. Home also became provided with a familiar. We shall allow him to tell his own story:—

"On the 3rd of April 1860 I had been with some friends to a lecture given in St. John's Wood, by M. Louis Blanc, 'On the mysterious persons and agencies in France towards the end of the eighteenth century.' His lecture was a good deal occupied with Cagliostro, and during the time he was speaking I had the strongest impression of the presence of Cagliostro; and the lady who was sitting next me was also aware of some strong spirit-presence, by having her dress pulled, and by other manifestations."

Here we pause to remark that those little eccentricities on the part of the Spirits, who seem to have an irresistible passion for manipulating ladies' dresses, may account for some of those occurrences in

tunnels which are not unfrequently made the subject of investigation in police-courts. It is difficult to see how this inconvenience can be remedied, unless the ghost of a departed stoker could be induced to act as guardian for each railway train. But to resume:—

"On returning home I found that my my wife had retired earlier than usual in consequence of a severe headache. In the course of conversation together, she having asked me how I liked the lecture, I said, 'I have been haunted all the evening by Cagliostro;' on which she exclaimed, 'Pray do not use that word haunted; it sounds so wierd-like, and quite frightens me.' I had by this time extinguished the light, and was now in bed; when, to my amazement, the room became as light as if the sun had for an instant shone brightly in at the window. Thinking that this effect might have been only on my spiritual perception, I said, 'Sacha, did you see anything?' Her reply was, 'No; nor could I, for my face was quite buried in my pillow, the pain in my head is so intense.' I asked her to observe, and I then mentally asked that if the light had been external it might be reproduced. Almost simultaneously with the thought came the light again, so distinct, and with such brilliancy, that no noonday was ever brighter. My wife asked if this was the spirit of Cagliostro, and the affirmative reply was instantly given by three flashes of light, so vivid as almost to be blinding and painful to the sight. Answers were given to various questions in the same wonderful manner, and then, in answer to a question asked, came a musical tinkle, as if a silver bell had been touched directly over our heads. In this way our further answers were now given, and we then heard a footstep on the floor, falling so gently as if it feared to disturb us by its approach. My wife asked that it should come nearer, and it approached us till we felt a form leaning over the bed. In doing this it pressed upon the bedclothes just as an actual material presence would have done. We asked him if he had been a medium when on earth, and in a distinct voice, audible to us both, he said in answer, 'My power was that of a mesmerist, but all misunderstood by those about me; my biographers have ever done me injustice; but I care not for the untruths of earth.'—Both my wife and myself were by this time so impressed by such startling and almost terribly real evidence of the presence of one who was no way related to us, that for a few moments all power of utterance seemed to have left us. We were, however, soon recalled to ourselves by a hand being placed on our heads, and she, seizing my hands in hers, held them up, saying, 'Dear Spirit! will you become one of my guardian angels—watch over me with my father—teach me what you would have me do, and make me thankful to God for all His mercies?' Our hands were clasped by a hand, and her left hand was gently separated from mine, and a ring, which was the signet-ring of my father-in law, was placed on her third finger. This ring was previously in the room, but at a distance of at least twelve feet from where the bed stood. 'Good-night, dear ones, and God bless you,' was then audibly spoken, and simultaneously with the sound came three wafts of perfume, so delicious that we both exclaimed, 'How truly wonderful!'"

Most wonderful indeed! and entirely corroborative of the statement

of the venerable Aubrey: "At Cirencester, 5th March 1670, was an apparition. Being demanded whether good spirit or bad, made no answer, but instantly disappeared with a curious perfume and a melodious twang." Great is the force of affinity! Like will to like; and on that principle it is not surprising that the ghost of Cagliostro should have paid a visit to Mr. Home. Cagliostro was, without any exception, the most impudent quack of his day. The story of his life is one unbroken record of audacious swindling. He was thief, vagabond, and coiner. He profeseed to have the secret of the Elixir Vitæ, and the art of transmuting the baser metals into gold. As a thaumaturgist and theosopher, he gave out that he could summon spirits. He was an accomplice in the famous plot of the Diamond Necklace, in connection with which Cardinal Rohan, cut so ridiculous a figure. He was driven in disgrace from every country in Europe which he polluted with his presence; and at length, in 1795, closed a life of debauchery and fraud in a Roman prison. It is charitable to suppose that Mr. Home was not aware of those particulars touching the mundane life of his spiritual visitor, else he would have hesitated to proclaim his intimacy with the ghost of such a scoundrel, and would have peremptorily desired it for the future to abstain from violating the sanctity of his nuptial chamber. If he had an option in the choice of a familiar spirit, he might have found a more suitable one by consulting the pages of Shakspeare. One of the characters in the play of Henry VI. is a certain *Hume*, who does a stroke of trade by assisting Margery Jourdain the witch, and Roger Bolinbroke the conjurer, in evoking a spirit to satisfy the curiosity of the Duchess of Gloster. Possibly he may have been a progenitor of our immaculate Daniel, at all events there is a strange, clannish resemblance in their speech, thought, and method of replenishing the exchequer.

> "*Hume.*—This they have promised—to show your highness
> A spirit raised from depth of under ground,
> That shall make answer to such questions
> As by your Grace shall be propounded him.
> *Duch.*—It is enough; I'll think upon the questions:
> When from St. Alban's we do make return,
> We'll see those things effected to the full.
> Here, Hume, take this reward; make merry, man,
> With thy confederates in this weighty cause."

Under the guidance and tuition of Cagliostro a decided improvement in the nature of the manifestations took place. Tables not only danced and expanded their mahogany claws after the fashion of the feline tribe, but soared into the air. Mr. Home also became preternaturally gassy. He began to float about the room, after the lights had

been put out, with the ease and precision of a Leotard, and the astonished spectators dimly descried his figure horizontally extended beneath the ceiling, like a stuffed alligator suspended in an apothecary's shop. The mode of operation, as described by an eyewitness, was rather peculiar:—

"Mr. Home was seated next the window. Through the semi darkness his head was dimly visible against the curtains, and his hands might be seen in a faint white heap before him. Presently he said, in a quiet voice, 'My chair is moving—I'm off the ground—don't notice me—talk of something else,' or words to that effect. It was very difficult to restrain the curiosity, not unmixed with a more serious feeling, which these few words awakened; but we talked, incoherently enough, upon some indifferent topic. I was sitting nearly opposite to Mr. Home, and I saw his hands disappear from the table, and his head vanish into the deep shadow beyond. In a moment or two more he spoke again. This time his voice was in the air above our heads. He had risen from his chair to a height of four or five feet from the ground. As he ascended higher he described his position as at first perpendicular, and afterwards horizontal. He said he felt as if he had been turned in the gentlest manner, as a child is turned in the arms of a nurse. In a moment or two he told us that he was going to pass across the window, against the grey silvery light of which he would be visible. We watched in profound silence, and saw his figure pass from one side of the window to the other, feet foremost, lying horizontally in the air. He spoke to us as he passed, and told us that he would turn the reverse way, and recross the window; which he did. His own tranquil confidence in the safety of what seemed from below a situation of the most novel peril, gave confidence to everybody else; but with the strongest nerves it was impossible not to be conscious of a certain sense of fear or awe. He hovered round the circle for several minutes, and passed, this time perpendicularly, over our heads. I heard his voice behind me in the air, and felt something lightly brush my chair. It was his foot, which he gave me leave to touch. Turning to the spot where it was on the top of the chair, I placed my hand gently upon it, when he uttered a cry of pain, and the foot was withdrawn quickly with a palpable shudder. It was evidently not resting on the chair, but floating, and it sprang from the touch as a bird would. He now passed over to the furthest extremity of the room, and we could judge by his voice of the altitude and distance he had attained. He had reached the ceiling, upon which he made a slight mark, and soon afterwards descended and resumed his place at the table. An incident which occurred during this aerial passage, and imparted a strange solemnity to it, was that the accordion, which we supposed to be on the ground under the window close to us, played a strain of wild pathos in the air from the most distant corner of the room."

At other *seances*, sprigs of geranium and verbena were liberally distributed by spiritual hands to the company. Mr. Home became a sort of Roman candle, emitting fiery balls; and on one occasion a jocular spirit took the unjustifiable liberty of purloining a tumbler of brandy.

and-water which a thirsty believer was in the very act of imbibing.

In justice to the Davenports we ought to state that their supporters claim for them the possession of powers equally extraordinary. Dr. Nichols gives the following narrative of phenomena which were observed at Buffalo:—

"The room was not darkened, only obscured to a pleasant twilight. After several of the usual phenomena were exhibited, the two boys were raised from their chairs, carried across the room, and held up *with their heads downwards* before a window. 'We distinctly saw,' says an eyewitness, (Query—Rand?) 'two gigantic hands attached to about three-fifths of a monstrous arm; and those hands grasped the ankles of the two boys, and thus held the lads heels up and heads downward, before the window; now raising, now lowering them, till their heads bade fair to make acquaintance with the carpet on the floor! This curious but assuredly not dignified exhibition was several times repeated, and was plainly seen by every person present. Among these persons present was an eminent physician, Dr. Blanchard, then of Buffalo, now of Chicago, Illinois, who was sitting on a chair, by the side of Elizabeth Davenport; and all present saw an immense arm, attached to no apparent body—growing, as it were, out of space—glide along near the floor, till it reached around Dr. Blanchard's chair, raised it from the floor with the child upon it, balanced it, and then raised it to the ceiling. The chair and child remained in the air, without contact with any person or thing, for a space of time estimated to be a minute, and then descended gradually to the place it first occupied."

We fear that Mr. Home, who, by his own account, has moved in the very highest circles of European society, and been received with marked distinction at more than one Imperial Court, may be shocked at finding his spiritual exhibitions classed in the same category with the more robustious demonstrations of the Davenports. There are ranks and grades even among magicians. Arbaces, the Egyptian, viewed with scorn the infernal concoctions of the witch of Vesuvius. Bacon regarded Bungay as a mountebank, and hated him with an intensity which only a conjuror can feel. Richard Graham, who, in the reign of King James, was "worried and burnt at the Cross of Edinburg," as a "notour and known necromancer, ane common abuser of the people," had for some years been noted as a prominent licentiate of the devil's medical college. He confessed to be familiar with spirits, but regarded common witchcraft as a mean and despicable thing, and would hold no communication with the Bessie Dunlops and Eupham M'Calyeans of the day. But we cannot afford to recognize any such nice distinctions. The miracles of the Davenports and of Mr. Home are substantially the same; and if it can be shown that the one are mere feats of jugglery and legerdemain, the credit of the other is overthrown.

The accounts which we have inserted of their several performan-

ces—exclusive of their own statements, which are of course worthless as testimony—are taken from their own publication and those of their confederates; are usually transcripts of letters which appeared from time to time in the newspapers; and, when authenticated by known signatures, may be regarded as the evidence of believers — But there is a vast deal of opinionative testimony on the other side, though no one has felt sufficient interest in the subject to take the pains to collect it. Innumerable letters have appeared in the newspapers and periodicals, from individuals who have attended the *seances* of the conjurors, and have satisfied themselves that the so-called manifestations are based upon impudent imposture. The so called spiritual communications, whether made by rappings or through mediums, have been childish and unsatisfactory in the extreme; and the ghosts appear, in the great majority of instances, to have lost not only their memories, but such amount of education as they had received in their former state of existence.

Conjuring tricks are no novelty. They are common to every country; and, through the exercise of ingenuity, they may doubtless be indefinitely multiplied. We have all heard of such jugglers as Hermann Boaz, who, some forty years ago, electrified the last generation by his performances; and we should be extremely puzzled if called upon to explain the method of some of the ingenious deceptions practised by Houdin or Anderson. When, therefore, fellows like the Davenports perambulate the country with an apparatus, and a conjuring box of peculiar and suspicious construction, we expect to be favored with some extraordinary feats of legerdemain, which shall entirely baffle our comprehension; for the essence of conjuring is, that the performer shall be able to throw dust in the eyes of the spectators. His whole art consists in producing illusions; and if he fails in doing that, he is not worthy of the name of conjuror. If M. Houdin, instead of honestly confessing that he produced his effects through sleight-of-hand, had claimed to be favored with supernatural assistance, and to be able, through magic, to perform miracles, he would at this momet have ranked higher in the estimation of the credulous than Mr. Daniel Douglas Home, and have utterly eclipsed the light of such minor luminaries as the Davenports. To maintain that we are bound to adopt the theory of preternatural agency in every case which baffles our individual or cllective powers of explanation, is simply the argument of an idiot. Nor is it much more rational to assume that there must be mysterious or occult forces at work to produce certain phenomena, seeing that common observation and experience demonstrate that deceptions, which are the mere results of manual dexterity, may be practised with success upon the shrewdest and most ob-

servant of mankind. The juggleries connected with the speaking heads and magic mirrors—the favorite utensils of the impostors of the middle ages—have long ago been exposed; and yet they were as firmly believed by the credulous of those times to be necromantic creations, as are the apparitions of spiritual hands by the gaping multitude who contribute to the coffers of Mr. Home.

It rather surprises us that the gentlemen and ladies who testify to having seen and handled these apparitions, have never subjected them to an experiment which would have given us some insight into their real nature. They are palpable, for we are told by many that they have felt them manipulating their knees and taking liberties with their persons. They are said to be soft, fleshy, and life-like—very different from the old apparitions, which were visible, but seldom tangible. They can, we are told, twitch tambourines, and such articles as form the stock-in-trade of the modern necromancer, from the grasp of spectators, *unless they are very tightly held*, in which case they fail; so that these mysterious agents are subject to precisely the same laws which regulate human bodies. If so, they must pe impressible; and we marvel greatly that it has occurred to no one to try what effect might be produced by a stab of a needle or a bodkin. Most significant is the phrase, *Rem acu tetigisti*. The ancient deities, according to Homer, were vulnerable; for he tells us that Mars bellowed and Venus whimpered when wounded by a mortal weapon. But the shades of the departed were impassive, or yielded like smoke before a well directed blow; and that quick-witted fellow, Marcellus, hit upon the true test when he proposed to strike at the ghost of Hamlet's father with his partisan. We now beg to offer a suggestion which, if acted on, will go far to solve all doubts as to the real nature of those apparitions. The poniard may possibly be regarded as a weapon too dangerous to be used in such experiments; but that objection can hardly apply to fish-hooks, which are light, handy, and withal comparatively innocuous. Let each man who is invited to attend a *seance* procure some half-dozen bait-hooks, of a size large enough to hold a grilse, tied on half a yard of gimp, which we recommend in preference to gut as less likely to yield to scissors. Let him be on the alert; and, whenever he feels a hand beneath the table pottering with his knees, or taking any other kind of liberty, let him strike smartly and at once, taking care to keep a tight hold of the other end of the line. If he attends to these directions, we venture to promise him as delectable sport as was ever enjoyed by an angler—always supposing that the fish are in a biting humour, which cannot, however, be relied on, unless the tackle is carefully concealed.

After what we have said, we need hardly reiterate our conviction

that the so-called manifestations are the mere tricks of impostors—unquestionably ingeniously devised, but not produced by any kind of supernatural agency. But many estimable people think otherwise.—They have witnessed certain exhibitions which they cannot explain upon ordinary principles, and they escape from their bewilderment by adopting the conclusion of the savage, who, when any wonderful object is presented for the first time to his view, pronounces it to be the work of magic. Having declared themselves of this faith, they become rampant champions of spiritualism, and denounce as Sadducees, materialists, and unbelievers, all the rest of mankind who refuse to believe in the divine mission of Home or the Davenports. That is scarcely fair. The question of spiritual agency is quite apart from the pretensions of any individual mountebank or charlatan. No part of the Christian revelation warrants us in maintaining that the power of darkness may not still be permitted to exercise a baneful and unholy influence; and the Savior himself vouchsafed to warn His followers of such a danger in these memorable words—"If any man shall say to you, Lo, here is Christ; or, Lo, he is there; believe him not. For false Christs and false prophets shall rise, and shall show signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect.—But take ye heed: behold, I have foretold you all things." Nor is there any mystical meaning, but a clear intimation of spiritual danger in the language of St. Paul to the Ephesians: "Put on the whole armor of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." And again, in the Epistle to the Corinthians, we are warned against "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ.—And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light."

Sorcery, and demoniac possession, implying the direct agency of evil spirits, are repeatedly noticed in the Acts of the Apostles; and we are told that, at Ephesus, many "which used curious arts, brought their books together, and burned them before all men;" thereby testifying that such practices were utterly repugnant to the spirit of the Christian religion. Indeed, throughout the whole Bible, no sin is more severely and emphatically denounced than that of holding traffic or communion with familiar spirits; and whatever may be said of the credulity of our ancestors, as evinced by their notable prosecutions of witches, they had sufficient warrant for punishing the crime if the guilt be clearly established. We peruse with horror and repugnance the old Justiciary and Presbytery records of Scotland, fill-

ed as they are with accounts of witch-trials usually terminating with an intimation that the unfortunate accused were convicted, strangled, or burnt at the stake—because we cannot bring ourselves to believe that they were really guilty of the practises set forth in such solemn yet grotesque detail. We do not believe, for example, that Marjory Mutch, having an ill will against William Smith in Tarsherhill, came to his plough and bewitched the oxen, so that "they instantly ran all wood (mad), brak the pleuch, twa whereof ran over the hills to Deer, and other twa thereof up Ithan side, whilk could never be tane nor apprehendit again"—or that she destroyed much cattle, laid sickness on many persons, and attended all the witch conventions of the district. We do not believe in the delinquency of Jane Wishart, accused of having laid, in revenge for the refusal of a loan, a *dwining* illness upon James Low, stabler, whereby he "melted away like ane burning candle," till he died. We do not believe—though we have her own distinct confession to that effect—that Agnes Sampson, in company with upwards of a hundred witches met the devil in the kirk of North Berwick, who appeared in the pulpit like "ane meikle black man," called over the infernal roll, and received a monstrous homage. We do not believe that the devil gave instructions to the witches for preparing a waxen image of King James to undergo a sympathetic roasting, or for raising storms to drown the Queen on her way from Denmark—or that Thomas Lees and his company went at midnight of Hallow-e'en to the market and fish crosses of Aberdeen, with the devil playing before them, and were there transformed, some as hares, some as cats, some in other likenesses, and all danced about the two crosses and the meal-market a long space of time. These trials were all regularly conducted; but even the most complete train of evidence fails to make us believe in such monstrosities; and we regard the execution of the accused persons as so many acts of judicial murder.—We believe those persons to have been innocent, not on strength of exculpatory evidence, but because we hold it utterly impossible that such crimes could have been committed. That is the general decision. But these new manifestations, if produced, as their authors and abettors maintain, by spiritual agency, must open up the question anew. Those who profess to work miracles under the influence and direction of the spirits of Cagliostro the swindler, and Henry Morgan the pirate, are, by their own confession, on a level with the worst of the wretches who, towards the close of the sixteenth century, were condemned to death for their unholy practices; and those who countenance their proceedings and frequent their *seances* for revelations, are partakers in the common crime.

The delusion which affects many people, who, while professing to

be Christians, are yet countenancing arts which Christianity emphatically condemns, is indeed fearful. They believe that they are permitted to receive messages from their departed friends—to hear their voices—nay, to feel their very hands, unchilled by the damp of the grave; and they talk and write of these things as affording them unspeakable comfort and consolation. For such a doctrine as that, there is no warrant in the word of God. "I shall go to him," said David when he lost his child, "but he shall not return to me!" We may trust with humble faith that the spirits of the righteous who have departed this life are in paradise, waiting for the day of judgemnt; but we shall never hear nor see them again until we also have left this tenement of flesh, and passed into the life beyond. There is a great gulf fixed between the living and the dead, and over the bridge that spans that gulf there is no possibility of returning. With the last breath, drawn by a man, all his connection with the world and with his kindred must cease. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

If, therfore, there be anything in those manifestations, beyond fraud, juggling, and deceit—if those who frequent and countenance them are not merely the dupes of clever impostors, acting with great subtlety upon that love of the marvellous which is so easily converted into a morbid affection of the fancy—what other conclusion can we form than this, that evil spirits are permitted to delude the unwary, and, by the exhibitions of false miracles, to draw them away from that pure and holy faith, without which there can be no salvation? Is it not, to say the least of it, significant that the persons who claim to have possession of this miraculous power, and to be able to work such wonders, should profess to derive that power from intercourse with the spirits of swindlers, ruffians, and malefactors? A more tainted source of inspiration can hardly be imagined. Truly the fiend, if he has any direct hand in this business, is operating through most worthy agents!

There is but one revelation given by God to man; and they who seek for another, voluntarily surrender themselves to delusion, and court the approaches of the tempter. It matters not whether the manifestations be real or pretended. If the former, those who seek for and solicit them are dabbling in a forbidden art; if the latter, they are miserably duped. We state the alternative, because, by their own confession, many persons have a sincere belief in the miraculous pretensions or Mr. Home, and some profess to have derived spiritual edification from the gymnastic exercises of the Davenports. They believe that spirits are made to come and go, that the portals of the grave are opened, and that the shades of the departed reappear, for

the one evident object of drawing crowds to the *seances* of the conjurers, and so contributing to their revenues! The invisible world is made the subject of speculation, and ghosts condescend to exhibit for the benefit of Yankee showmen!

If the amiable but deluded persons who have entered upon this course of sin and folly are obstinate in turning a deaf ear to the remonstrances of reason and religion—if they should still persist in oracles more impure and fallacious than those of the Pagan times—if they are determined to set the dictates of Christianity at defiance, and consort with questionable characters, who vaunt of ther intimacy with familiar spirits,—then their case indeed is hopeless; and their sentence is written in the words—"EPHRAIM IS JOINED TO HIS IDOLS: LET HIM ALONE."

PROTESTANT HYMNOLOGY.

In ranging over the fields of hymnic literature, one meets with much that is attractive and inspiring—much, also, that is curious and amusing. A reliable history of hymns and their authors, would be deeply interesting; for often there is a touching history in a hymn, and a knowledge of the circumstances under which it was written, would enhance our interest and gratification. Many of the Protestant hymns were written in stormy and perilous times, to give courage and confidence to the suffering saints—as those of LUTHER; many, in seasons of unwonted religious fervor, when the anguished heart, in its darkness, and the uplifted heart, in its raptures, demanded impassioned utterance—as is evident in many of the compositions of CHARLES WESLEY; many, in times of bitter religious controversy, designed to engraft the peculiarities of the author's creed on his songs, that he might *sing* his notions into the *hearts* of the people with better success than he found in *arguing* them into their *heads*—as we take to be the case with TOPLADY, and others of his time. Some were the offspring of the direst spiritual anguish, when "the violated law spoke out its thunders,"—as with COWPER; while in others of the same admired author, written in hours of calm or rapture which at intervals broke in on the darkness, "in strains as sweet as angels use, when the Gopel whispers peace." Occasionally a lyric of immortal grandeur is struck off in an hour of happy inspiration by an author whose general style is tame or strained—and we long to know its secret history; while others seem to be fountains of lyrical freshness and power, whose living streams flow out in exhaustless fullness, and follow you through all the windings of the wilderness. To us, the two grandest names in the latter class, are ISAAC WATTS and CHARLES WESLEY,

You do not, with them, ask after the history of particular hymns, but for the history of the *men* who sung forever, and have set the whole religious world aflame with their lyrical raptures. Others, of less pretensions, such as Mrs. Steele, Mrs. Barbauld, Cenneck, Kelly, Heber, Mrs. Adams, and Miss Elliott, are like springs in the desert, bubbling musically up in arid wastes, refreshing many a weary traveller, and making the desert rejoice for many a league around with tokens of life and beauty.

But it is not our object to write a history of hymns, or of their authors; nor yet a *critique* on the present hymnology of the churches; but merely to note, as a matter of interest, some of the curiosities to be gathered in this attractive field. We can but glance, in a single paper, at a few specimens of the oddities and crudities that belong to this peculiar class of literature.

Hymns, we take it, are designed mainly to express *sentiment* and *emotion*: thanks, joy, hope, love, penitence, trust, and the longings and aspirations of the soul. They are meant, therefore, to possess the *lyric* rather than the *epic* character; although narrative of mighty deeds, as a basis of emotional culture, is warrantable, just so far as it may serve this purpose. Many of the grand histories in the Bible might be wrought into spiritual *ballads* to serve the purpose of popular instuction;—but we have noticed that very few narrative hymns are favorites in our worship. Our hymn books are encumbered with compositions, not always wanting in poetical merit, but entirely wanting in lyrical power—without capacity to touch the heart, or wake it to any sentiment of love, trust, or joy. We would be glad to know of any especial spiritual end to be served, for instance, by singing the following stanzas:

"The land in plenty brought forth frogs
In chambers of their Kings;
His word all sorts of flies and lice
In all their borders brings.

"He spake, and caterpillars came,
Locusts did much abound;
Which on their lands all herbs consumed,
And all fruits of their ground."

This is all true, and was written for our profit; *but what is the use of singing it?* Think of an assembly of Christian worshippers, solemnly singing, to Mear or St Martin's, this doggerel about the frogs, lice, and caterpillars of Egypt!

But in reaching after the fountains of the *emotional*, we are often close on the borders of the *theological;* and, especially in times when theological controversy runs high, it is difficult to avoid foisting into

the hymnology of a church the favorite dogmas in behalf of which the battle-cry is sounding. We have almost innumerable instances of this. Let any one who is curious, take up Watts' Psalms and Hymns, and count the recurrences of the word *sovereign*, and he will readily see how, even with this most gifted and most worthy of all our English writers of sacred lyrics, the Calvanistic theology was allowed, perhaps unwittingly, to tinge his poetical effusions.

Thus, too, on the atonement, he sometimes sings his theology:

"Once 'twas a dreadful seat of wrath,
And shot devouring flame;
Our God appeared consuming fire,
And vengeance was his name.

"Rich were the drops of Jesus' blood,
That calm'd his frowning face,
That sprinkled o'er the burning throne,
And turn'd the wrath to grace."

Is it possible for any pious heart to sing such a theology as this, and not freeze the gratitude and rapture that filled the soul when singing,

"Alas! and did my Savior bleed!"

or,

"When I survey the wondrous cross."?

In heavier measure does this censure fall on TOPLADY, who, though he has written some of the sweetest hymns in our language, seldom rises on the wings of his muse, that he does not carry his theological blunderbuss, ready cocked and primed, to discharge at the first shadow of Arminian heresy that comes within his range.

"And will the righteous judge of men
Condemn me for that debt of sin,
Which, Lord, was charged on thee?

"Complete atonement thou hast made,
And to the utmost farthing paid
Whate'er THY PEOPLE *owed*;

How then can wrath on me take place,
If shelter'd in thy righteousness
And sprinkled with thy blood?

Now, while accepting, in the fullest import of Scripture language, the death of Christ as a sin-offering, and possessing a constant dread of that style of interpretation which would fritter away the rich and precious utterances of the Spirit, until nothing is left of the sacrifice of the Lamb of God but a tame martyrdom; we must still be allowed to say that this transposition of the commercial theory of the atonement into rhyme, to be sung in churches, is an awful degradation of

the noblest of themes, and an entire perversion of the design of sacred song. It is singing *a theory*. It is foisting that theory into the solemn services of the sanctuary. It is smuggling the contraband wares of controversial theology into the temple of God, under the sanctity of hymns of praise to the Most High.

But all this is tame, compared with a fragment quoted by SPURGEON, in a sermon on the atonement, as expressive of his views of the results of the sacrifice of Christ:

"At one tremendous draught of love,
He drank damnation dry!

This is an extravagance of hyperbole, growing less out of the poetic raptures of a soul inspired with the love of God in Christ, than out of the infatuations of a pet theology.

It is pleasant to think, however, that in the conflict which often raged in the breasts of good men, between the stern dicta of their theological creed and the mellowing inspirations of the sacred muse, the triumph was most frequently given to the poet over the theologian.—Many a beautiful hymn, intended, when written, to inspire militant hosts against their theological foes, rose so grandly above all the earth-born passions of the conflict into the purity, and sweetness, and catholicity of sentiment and feeling which the Gospel inspires, that it was caught up by the opposing forces as equally expressive of *their* emotions. Witness TOPLADY'S matchless hymn—

"Rock of Ages, cleft for me;"

And that grand old heart-hymn—

"How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord;"

And the more rugged, but scarcely less popular lyric—

"Though troubles assail, and dangers affright."

What a commentary is it on the emptiness of the heated controversies of the past, that scores of such hymns as these, written originally in the service of particular election, final perseverance, free grace, etc., are now the common property of all parties, and are sung with equal fervor and delight by Calvinist and Arminian! The clash of swords has died away; the lumbering logic of heavy mailed knights, and the excitement and glory of their theological tilts and tournaments, are buried in forgetfulness; but the sweet breathings of love and trust, that hallowed and glorified their better moments, when they stood in the sacred shadow of the cross and the altar, live in immortal song! With raptured touch they swept the strings of the harp of God, and notes of tenderness and joy and triumph sprung into life, whose echoes are floating yet in unearthly sweetness, in every house of prayer, and in every heart that is struggling through the bit-

ter conflicts of earth, homeward to the pure heavens. But their tones of speculative theology are thrown aside in lumber-rooms, or are covered thick with undisturbed dust, on the shelves of the antiquarian! But we must not moralize now.

Of all themes for sacred song, one of the most ungainly and unfeasible is the doctrine of personal unconditional election, involving all that is knotty in the vexed questions of foreknowledge, necessity, and the freedom of the will. Whatever there may be in it of truth or error, does not concern us here. But, true or false, where is its poetry? It is the hardest of nuts for the hammer of the sturdy logician; a bone of contention for grim theological pugilists; a trail to lure the keen scent of medieval scholastics: the Gordian not of theology. A hymn on the quadrature of the circle might be made about as poetical, and scarcely less edifying. You may argue, wrangle, protest, exhort, dehort, fight, pray over it, if need be; but to *sing* it!! Yet this ungainly and knotty doctrine, in its most puzzling and repulsive aspects, has been made to stare at us in our hymn-books; and its vexatious subtleties have been set to music, to be sung to "the praise of God"! Listen:

"He for the sins of all the elect
Hath a complete atonement made:
And justice never can expect
That the same debt should twice be paid."

There! can you sing that through in any long measure of ordinary solemnity, and not feel your head ready to split with the puzzling problems in theology that spring up in your brain?

"Behold the potter and the clay:
He forms his vessels as he please;
Such is our God, and such are we,
The subjects of his just decrees.

"Doth not the workman's power extend
O'er all the mass, which part to choose
And mould it for a nobler end,
And which to leave for viler use?

"May not the sovereign Lord on high
Dispense his favors as he will;
Choose some to life while others die,
And yet be just and gracious still?"

We say nothing here of the evident misapplication of the teaching of the Scriptures concerning the potter and the clay. We only ask the reader to imagine the effects of singing such hymns:—the ineffable complacency of the elect Pharisees—the unutterable gloom and

anguish of humble hearts that dare not arrogate to themselves the honor of a place among the elect!

"How many hearts thou might'st have had,
More innocent than mine!
How many souls *more worthy far*
Of that pure touch of thine!

"Ah Grace! into *unlikeliest* hearts
It is thy boast to come!"

And again:

"'Tis not that I did choose thee,
For, Lord, that could not be;
This heart would still refuse thee,
But thou hast chosen me."

Once more:

"Determin'd was the manner how
We should be brought the Lord to know;
Yea, he decreed the very place
Where he would call us by his grace."

TOPLADY has a hymn beginning—

"How happy are we, our election who see."

But where one has ventured to sing it with any confidence, a thousand have burst forth in joyful strains—

"How happy are they who their Savior obey."

The former is well nigh forgotten—the latter rings in notes of holy triumph, over all the world.

Clearly akin to these election hymns, are others on final perseverance:

"Whom once he receives
His Spirit ne'er leaves,
Nor ever repents of the grace that he gives."

"Did Jesus once upon me shine?
Then Jesus is forever mine."

"Yes! I to the end shall endure,
As sure as the earnest is given;
More happy, *but not more secure,*
The glorified spirits in heaven!"

Another very unpoetical theme is *human depravity.* Much even that is true on this painful subject, is surely not fit to be set to music. I would rather seek poetical inspiration in the fumes and brine of the Dead Sea, or attempt to extract a theme of praise out of the apples of Sodom, than to write hymns on human depravity, to be sung in churches!

"Sin like a venomous disease,
Infects our vital blood."

May be so: *but why do you want to sing it?*

"Our nature's totally depraved—
The heart a sink of sin:
Without a change we can't be saved—
'Ye must be born again.'"

This is bad rhyme, bad versification, bad poetry; and not very good theology. But if it were entirely true in sentiment, and smooth in expression, and faultless in rhythm, what is there in it that can be called *lyrical?* Imagine yourself trying to lift your heart to God, singing these words!

Linked in with this same theological system, are the hymns of *doubt* and *anguish* which we could never conceive as being thoughtfully sung, without the heart undergoing a petrifaction of terror.

"I'll to the gracious King approach,
Whose scepter pardon gives;
Perhaps he may command my touch,
And then the suppliant lives.

"*Perhaps* he will admit my plea—
Perhaps will hear my pray'r;
But if I perish, I will pray,
And perish only there."

This is based on the language of ESTHER, when about to venture *unasked*, on a desperate errand, into the presence of a capricious despot: "If I perish, I perish." The reader cannot fail to perceive that the theology of the writer has transferred the capriciousness of this oriental despot to the Merciful God,—although he has solemnly sworn that he has no pleasure in the death of him that dieth; and whose merciful invitation is, "Whosoever will, let him take of the waters of life freely."

Here is another:

"How long, thou faithful God, shall I,
Here in thy ways forgotten lie?
When shall the means of healing be
The channels of thy grace to me?

"Sinners on every side step in,
And wash away their pain and sin,
But I, a helpless, sin-sick soul
Still lie expiring at the pool.

"Thou Cov'nant-angel, swift come down,
To-day, thine own appointments crown:
Thy power into the means infuse,
And give them now their sacred use.

"Thou seest me lying at the pool—
I would, *thou knowst I would*, be whole,
Oh, let the troubled waters move,
And minister thy healing love.

Dare any one, living in sin and rebellion, in the midst of the abundant means of salvation, thus clear himself of blame, and charge the responsibility of his unregenerate condition on the *unwillingness of God to save?* This is but one of a large class of hymns, which ignoring the Gospel offers of salvation, are continually saying, "Who shall ascend into heaven?" that is, to bring Christ down from above.

We have always felt, in regard to the final destiny of the wicked, that it was not a theme for song, except as it could be made a basis for pathetic expostulation with the careless and impenitent. That an immense hortatory power may be dispensed in lyrical form, with all the advantage of earnest entreaty, pathetic appeal, and even logical force, any one will be convinced by reading the original of Charles Wesleys' hymn, beginning

"What could your Redeemer do."

And in such an appeal, the muse might draw upon the awful and tremendous considerations of the sinner's final doom—but tenderfully and tearfully, as did the Savior when he announced the impending doom of Jerusalem. But a harsh and gloomy theology delights itself with the cruelest forms of woe and anguish, and indulges in deseriptions, which certainly no human voice, nor harp, nor organ can render into suitable strains. It would demand a choir of grimy demons to sing the following:

"His nostrils breathe out fiery streams;
And from his awful tongue
A sovereign voice divides the flames,
And thunder roars along.

"Think, O my soul, the dreadful day
When this incensed God
Shall rend the sky, and burn the sea,
And fling his wrath abroad.

"Tempests of angry fire shall roll
To blast the rebel worm,
And beat upon his naked soul
In one eternal storm,"

Here is something still more terrible,

"Eternal plagues and heavy chains,
Tormenting racks and fiery coals,
And darts to inflict immortal pains,
Dipp'd in the blood of damned souls!

"There Satan, the first sinner, lies,
And roars, and bites his iron bands;
In vain the rebel strives to rise,
Crushed with the weight of both thy hands.

"There guilty ghosts of Adam's race
Shriek out, and howl beneath thy rod," etc.

Again:

"Thoughts, like old vultures, prey upon their heart-strings,
And the smart twinges, when the eye beholds the
Lofty Judge frowning, and a flood of vengeance
Rolling afore him.

"Hopeless immortals! how they scream and shiver
While devils push them to the pit wide-yawning,
Hideous and gloomy to receive them headlong
Down to the center!"

We do not doubt that there are themes for the poet amid the awful wreck and ruin of human nature, in the world of wo; but we cannot but wonder that any sinful mortal tongue should attempt to *sing* on such a theme.

Before dismissing the *theology* of hymns, we must treat our readers to a precious *morceau*, from another source. We should not have thought of preserving it, had we not found it in a leading Baptist paper, published with evident approval. It is a hymn sung at the close of a series of those delightful *union* meetings, which are frequently held by different denominations,—meetings in which they first unite to make converts, and then scramble for the spoils.—The last day of of the meeting had arrived. All had been harmony. But now the converts were to decide to which of the churches they would attach themselves. The tug of war now comes on. The different preachers put in a plea, every one for his own party. But the Baptist preacher rose, and sung, in a clear and powerful voice the subjoined *hymn*, which carried such power with it as to sweep all the converts into the Baptist church:

"Come all ye loving Christians,
Who feel the sacred fire,
Obey the truth to-day,
And prove the devil a liar.—
And to glory we will go.

"I had rather be a Baptist,
And have a shining face,
Than to be a Methodist
And always fall from grace.
And to glory we will go.

I had rather be a Baptist,
And despised every hour,
Than a Presbyterian
And never have the power.
And to glory we will go.

If sprinkling is convenient
It has no claim to truth,
It may be good for babies,
But will not do for youth,
And to glory we will go."

And this reminds us that among the hymns of theology we ought not to neglect the hymns used at the sprinkling of infants. Here is the beginning of one:

"Jesus! we lift our souls to Thee,
The Holy Spirit breathe;
And let this little infant be
Baptized into thy death.

O let thine unction on it rest,
Thy grace its soul renew;
And write within its tender breast,
Thy name and nature too."

Another:

"O Spirit! brooding o'er the wave,
Descend upon this child;
Give endless life; its spirit lave
With waters undefiled.

"O Triune God! speak, and 'tis done
We speak,—but thine the might:
This child hath scarcely seen our sun
Yet pour on it thy light.

We really think that Pedobaptists who can sing such sentiments, need not lift their hands in holy horror at the dogma of baptismal regeneration, nor find difficulty in accepting any other absurdity that their creed may offer them.

But if lyrical poetry has suffered on one hand by such infusions of theological doctrine, it has been vastly degraded on the other by the extravagances of emotional culture in some religious bodies, especially the Methodists. The merest rant, the most utter nonsense, the most irreverent phraseology bordering on profanity—abound in the style of song popular in revival meetings, class meetings, &c.—We do not desire to disfigure our pages with them, but shall submit two or three specimens:

"If ever I pitch my tent again,
Never will come back any more
I'll pitch it where Satan can't get in,
Never will come back any more
No, no! never &c.

"What makes me praise my Lord so bold,
I'm on my way to glory,
I've got religion in my soul,
I'm on my way to glory

"I'll tell you when I feel the best,
I'm on my way to glory,
It's when my soul has just been blest,
I'm on my way to glory."

"You'll see the graves a opening,
A opening, a opening
You'll see the graves a opening
On that great day.

"Then we'll take the wings of the morning,
And fly away to Jesus,
We'll take the wings of the morning,
And sound the Jubilee."

In a kind of a ballad, called "The Firm Bank," containing 15 verses, the last will serve as a specimen of the whole:

"But see the wretched dying thief,
Hang by the Banker's side
He cried, 'Dear Lord, remember me,'
And got his cash—and died!"

It may seem incredible to persons not familiar with the extravagances of revival meetings, that such contemptible doggerel, and vulgar nonsense could be tolerated in the worshipping assemblies of enlightened Protestants. But we have quoted from the *eighth edition* of a book called "Choral hymns," published in the city of Philadelphia, in the year of grace, 1858. And we have given by no means the worst specimens.

But there are many hymns of more merit, in which the *exceeding sensuousness* of the imagery is altogether offensive to pure taste. Yet the popularity of such hymns serves to show how gross and sensuous are the conceptions and feelings of the religious community.

How exceedingly popular is NEWTON'S hymn:

"How tedious and tasteless the hours."

It is found in most of our hymn-books. Yet I have been told of a parody, in which JAMIE is substituted for Jesus, and with scarcely a verbal alteration besides, it makes a splendid love song!

And this gross sensuousness becomes offensive, in many ways destroying the dignity of spiritual themes, and degrading our conceptions of religious truth to the level of earth's leaden materialisms.—STENNETT has written some beautiful hymns—but he often mars his compositions with a rough daub of earthliness, that disfigures and defiles the whole performance.

"Yonder—amazing sight! I see
The incarnate Son of God,
Expiring on the accursed tree,
And welt'ring in his blood.

"Behold a purple torrent run
Down from his hands and head:
The crimson tide puts out the sun,
His groans awake the dead.

Every reader will feel the italicized lines jar on his heart. The coarse attempt to paint a painful picture in the first instance: the strained and extravagant effort at sublimity in the second.

As we conclude this ramble over the fields of lyric poetry, we have only time to say—what the reader has propably concluded in his own mind by this time—that it is no easy task to write a good hymn—no light labor, to make a creditable selection of hymns, suitable for the pure worship of Jehovah.

I have fully satisfied myself that no compilation of Hymns in use has, in the same space, so much merit, and so little that is trashy, as that which we are using. It is not wide enough in its range—has too much of the *epic* and not enough of the genuine *lyrical* character. Y et it is marked by a pure taste, and a more careful scriptural accuracy than any book in our knowledge.

It would have pleased us better to have gathered up some of the hidden gems of sacred poesy—the "flowers that blush unseen," and brought them out to view. But it occurred to us that the specimens now furnished might be made useful in leading us into a better appreciation of the Gospel liberty we enjoy—so far removed from the gloom and awfulness and uncertainty that sadden even the songs and throw darkness over the worship of multitudes of the pious, who are still entangled in the snares of human authority. I. E.

TRENCH'S GREEK SYNONYMS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The second volume of Dr. Trench's Greek Synonyms of the New Testament has been for some months before the public. The ardent thorough student of the Greek language must feel deeply grateful to this eminent, high-minded scholar for his earnest labors in this field, the ripe fruits of which have now been given to us in the two volumes thus far published. We trust these labors of Dr. Trench are not yet ended. Much more is yet to be done for the synonomy of the Greek New Testament than these volumes afford us. We prefer, however, this leisurely hastening of the eminent scholar and theologian. Rather this patient delay than the superficial, unripe, pretentious haste manifested so often in our day, even in the most sacred, weighty and profound matters. The man who has both the cultivated, enlightened mind, the thorough conscientiousness, and the deeply felt regard for truth, to appreciate and respect the true importance of tasks like these, dares not be in haste:—he will step slowly and reverently, for he feels that he is on holy ground. The mature fruits of a thorough, patient knowledge alone we want and need; all else has no value for us.

The study of the Greek language is a sacred legacy left especially, and for all time, to the Christian Church. The finger of God points this out to us, in selecting, as an act of his sovereign wisdom, this language to be the treasure-house of his word,—the Word of life to all nations. The Christian, therefore, must accept it as a high charge, to cherish, to honor, and to teach, in its richest fulness this greatest language of earth;—greatest in the marvellous perfections of the language itself, standing in this respect far above any language ever spoken by man, but also because it was divinely appointed as the bearer to the nations of the history of Christ and the redemption, and of the full revelation of the perfect will of God. The Hebrew is but its harbinger, the Latin and the other tongues of earth but its servants. The original of the New Testament, to the very end of time must always be the court of the last instance of final reference, in the great investigations and controversies of the divine truth. The more wide-spread and perfect the knowledge of this tongue,—especially as it appears in the New Testament, the better for the interests of the truth in Christ.

Now to secure a master's dominion in any language,—and especially in the great ancient tongues,—a thorough study of its synonomy is absolutely indispensible. More than this,—to no language does this apply in so high a degree as to the Greek, because it is the most refined, subtle, and abundant of all the tongues ever spoken by man.—In its creative power,—its power to multiply all classes of words, it is, and perhaps will ever be, especially if the millennarians are to any degree right,—unequalled. From a single root grows up a mighty tree of kindred words, whose boughs again touch the fruitful earth, the Greek mind,—and send up new generations of cognate words. This wonderful exuberance of the Greek mind and the Greek language, with their subtleness and power of discrimination, has created a synonomy rich beyond comparison. The importance and necessity of the study of this branch of the ancient languages, is daily more and more understood and practically recognized in the best schools. Thus far, however, but little has yet been done, as a special work, in this field by scholars, either in the classic or New Testament Greek.—The Latin language has in this respect been more fortunate than the Greek.

Although the New Testament is not written in the high order of the classic Greek, yet Greek synonomy occupies a large and very important space in all the books of the new covenant. The thorough student of these books cannot successfully proceed in his investigations without recognizing the distinctions these synonyms offer to his mind. In our common Version very often these distinctions are not recogni-

zed, and two or more words are rendered by a single word. And yet on critical examination we find the Holy Spirit evidently intended differences. The thorough study of Greek synonomy must do much to give us, hereafter, better versions of the New Testament.

Dr. Trench, besides a careful comparison of the synonymous words in the New Testament, by which process great light is thrown on the passages in which they occur, has also illustrated by citations from the Septuagint and the classic authors, the uses and meanings of the synonyms. More than this, he gives us the passages from the Greek authors in which these synonyms occur side by side, and others in which these authors themselves compare these words and discuss their meanings. Copious references are also made to other languages to illustrate the exact differences between words of kindred signification. This is precisely what we want. It gives us a rich treasure for constant use in our study of the New Testament. Unfortunately for the mere English reader, the quotations are not translated. This, however, could not have been well avoided, as the quotations had to be given in the original to satisfy the critical student, and a translation in every case, would have very much cumbered the book. Yet even the mere English scholar can gather largely from these two volumes, with but the English New Testament in his hand, as any one can discover by trial.

In the two volumes thus far given us, many of the most important words of the New Testament come up for examination. Among these are the words for life, servant, world and age, repent and repentance, temple, fleshly and carnal, wisdom, love, spiritual, goodness, holy, sin, knowledge, prayer, propitiation, new, spirit, &c., &c. The author throws much light on many passages of the New Testament in the course of his investigations. The whole treatise throughout the two volumes is pervaded by that spirit of profound religious earnestness and piety, as well as illustrative of the thorough scholarship, for which the eminent author is in all his works so distinguished. It is not a mere collation from other workers in the same field, we have before us, but the results of original inquiries. It is altogether with much pleasure that we can recommend these two volumes to the student of the books of the New Covenant.

It is our intention to give to the readers of the *Harbinger* some chapters from these volumes, by way of illustrations of treasures that are therein contained, translating the quotations for the sake of the mere English reader. We give below, in this number, the chapter on the words translated "new," revealing a distinction that adds new interest to the passages in which they occur. C. L. L.

"νέος, καινός.

"We translate both these words by the one English word 'new,' and there are those who deny that any difference can in the New Testament be traced between them. They derive a certain plausible support for this assertion from the fact that manifestly νέος and καινός oftentimes are interchangeably used; thus νέος ἄνθρωπος (Col. iii. 10), 'the new man,' and καινὸς ἄνθρωπος (Eph. ii. 15), 'the new man' also; νέα διαθήκη (Heb. xii. 24) and καινὴ διαθήκη (Heb. ix. 15), both 'a new covenant;' νέος οἶνος (Matt. ix. 17) and καινὸς οἶνος (new wine) (Matt xxvi. 29). The words, it is urged, are evidently of the same force and significance. But this does not follow, and in fact is not so. The same covenant may be qualified as νέα or καινή, but it is contemplated from a different point of view, according as it has one epithet applied to it or the other. It is the same in the other instances adduced: the same man, or the same wine, may be νέος or καινός; but a different notion is predominant according as the one epithet is applied or the other, and it will not be hard presently to demonstrate as much.

"Contemplate the new under the aspects of *time*, as that which has more recently come into existence, and this is νέος, (see Pott, *Etymol. Forsch.* 2d. ed. vol. i. p. 290—292). Thus the young are continually οἱ νέοι, or οἱ νεώτεροι, the generation which has lately sprung up; so, too, νέοι θεοί, the younger race of gods, Jupiter, Apollo, and other Olympians (Æschylus, *Prom. Vinct.* 991, 996), as set over against Saturn, Ops, and the dynasty of elder deities whom they had dethroned. But contemplate the new, not under the aspect of *time*, but of *quality*, the new, as set over against that which has seen service, the outworn, the exhausted or marred through age, and this is καινός: thus καινὸν ἱμάτιον (Luke v. 36), 'a new garment,' as contrasted with one threadbare and outworn; καιναὶ ἀσκοί, 'new wine skins' (Matt. ix. 17; John ix. 19); and in this sense, καινὸς οὐρανός (2 Pet. iii. 13), 'a new heaven,' as set over against that which has waxen old, and shows signs of decay and dissolution (Heb. i. 11, 12). In like manner, καιναὶ γλῶσσαι (new tongues,) (Mark xvi. 17) does not express the recent commencement of this miraculous speaking with tongues, but the unlikeness of these tongues to any that went before, therefore called also ἕτεραι γλῶσσαι (Acts ii. 4), tongues different from any hitherto known. Thus also, that καινὸν μνημεῖον, (new tomb,) in which Joseph of Arimathea laid the body of our Lord (Matt. xxvii. 60), is not one lately hewn from the rock, but one which had never yet been used, in which no other dead had ever lain, making the place ceremonially unclean (Matt. xxiii. 27). It might have been hewn out a hundred years before, and would thus have forfeited its right to the epithet νέος, but if never turned to use before it would be καινός still. That it should be so was part of that

divine decorum which ever attended the Lord in the midst of the humiliations of His earthly life (cf. Luke xix. 30; 1 Sam. vi. 7; 2 Kin. ii. 20).

"It will be seen from what has been said that καινός will often, as a secondary notion, imply praise, for the new is commonly better than the old; thus everything is new in heaven, 'the new Jerusalem' (Rev. iii. 12); 'a new song' (v. 9); 'a new heaven and new earth' (xxi. 1, cf. 2 Pet. iii. 13); 'all things new' (xxi. 5). But this not of necessity; for it is not always, and in everything, that the new is better, but sometimes the old; thus, the old friend (Eccles. ix. 10), and the old wine (Luke v. 39), are better than the new. And in many other cases καινός may express only the novel and strange, as contrasted, and that unfavorably, with the known and the familiar. Thus I observed just now that νέοι θέοι was a title given to the younger generation of gods; but when it was brought as a charge against Socrates that he had sought to introduce καινοὺς θεούς, or καινὰ δαιμόνια, 'new divinities,' into Athens (Plato, *Apol.* 26 *b*, cf. ξένα δαιμόνια, Acts xvii. 18), something quite different from this was meant—a novel pantheon, such gods as Athens had not hitherto been accustomed to worship. So, too, they who exclaim of Christ's teaching, "What new doctrine [καινὴ διδαχή] is this?" mean anything but praise (Mark i. 27).

"Follow up these words into their derivatives and compounds, and it will be found that the same distinction comes yet more clearly out: thus, νεότης (1 Tim. iv. 12) is youth; καινότης (Rom. vi. 4] is newness; νεοειδής, of youthful appearance; καινοειδής of novel unusual appearance; νεολογία (if there had existed such a word) would have been, a younger growth of words as contrasted with the old stock of the language, or, as we say, 'neologies;' καινολογία, which does exist in the later Greek, a novel anomalous invention of words, constructed on different principles from those which the language had recognized hitherto; φιλόνεος, a lover of youth (Lucian, *Amor.* 24); φιλόκαινος, a lover of novelty (Plutarch, *De Mus.* 12).

"There is a passage in Polybius (v. 75, 4), as there are many elsewhere (Clement of Alexandria, *Pædag.* i. 5, will supply one), in which the words occur together; but neither in this are they employed as a mere rhetorical accumulation; each has its own special significance. Relating a stratagem by which the town of Selge was very nearly surprised and taken, Polybius makes this observation, notwithstanding the many cities which have evidently been lost through the same device, we are, some way or other, still *new and young* in regard of similar deceits (καινοί τινες αἰεὶ καὶ νέοι πρὸς τὰς τοιαύτας ἀπάτας πεφύκαμεν,) and ready to be deceived by them over again. Here καινοί is an epithet applied to men in respect to their rawness and inexpe-

rience, νέοι in respect to their youth. It is true that these two, inexperience and youth, go often together; thus νέος and ἄπειρος (inexperienced, untried) are joined by Plutarch (*De Rect. Rat. And.* 17); but this is not of necessity. An old man may be raw and unpracticed in the affairs of the world, therefore καινός: there have been many young men, νέοι as regarded age, who were well skilled and exercised in these.

"Apply the distinction here drawn, and it will be manifest that the same wine, or the same man, may be at once νέος and καινός, and yet different meanings may be, and may have been intended to be, conveyed, as the one word was used, or the other. Take for example the νέος ἄνθρωπος (new man) Col. iii. 10, and the καινός ἄνθρωπος of Ephes. ii. 15. Contemplate under the aspect of time that mighty change which has found and is finding place in the man who has become obedient to the truth, and you will call him subsequently to this change, νέος ἄνθρωπος: the old man in him, and it well deserves this name, for it dates as far back as Adam, has died; a new man has been born, who therefore is fitly called νέος. But, on the other hand, contemplate, not now under aspects of time, but of quality and condition, this same mighty transformation; behold the man who, through long contact with the world, inveterate habits of sinning, had grown outworn and old, casting off the old conversation, as the snake its shriveled skin, coming forth again a new creation (καινὴ κτίσις), from his heavenly Maker's hands' with a πνεῦμα καινόν (new Spirit) given to him (Ezek. xi. 18), and you have here the καινὸς ἄνθρωπος, one prepared to walk in newness of life (ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς, Rom. vi. 4) through the ἀνακαίνωσις (renewing) of the Spirit (Tit. iii. 5); compare the Epistle of Barnabas, 16, ἐγενόμεθα καιροὶ, πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς κτιζόμενοι, (we have become new, being created again as from the beginning). Often as the words in this application would be interchangeable, yet there are also times when they would not be so. Take for instance the saying of Clement of Alexandria (*Pæd.* i. 6), χρὴ γὰρ εἶναι καινοὺς Λόγου καίνου μετειληφότας, (for the partakers of the new Word should be new). How impossible it would be to substitute νέους or νέου here. Take, again, the verbs ἀνανεοῦν Fphes. iv. 23), and ἀνακαινοῦν (renew) Col. iv. 10. We have need ἀνανεοῦσθαι, and we have need ἀνακαινοῦσθαι. It is indeed the same mysterious process, to be brought about by the same almighty Agent; but it is the same regarded from different points of view; ἀνανεοῦσθαι, to be made *young* again, ἀνακαινοῦσθαι, to be made *new* again.

"Apply this in the other instances quoted above. New wine may be characterized as νέος or καινός, but from different points of view. As it is νέος, it is tacitly contrasted with the vintage of the past years; as it is καινός we may assume it austere and strong, in contrast with the

which is χρηστός, sweet and mellow through age (Luke v. 39). So, too, the Covenant of which Christ is the Mediator is a διαθήκη νέα, as compared with the Mosaic covenant, given nearly two thousand years before; it is a διαθήκη καινή as compared with the same, effete with age, and from which all vigor, energy, and strength had departed (Heb. viii. 13).

A Latin grammarian, drawing the distinction between 'recens' and 'novus,' has said, 'Recens ad *tempus*, novum *ad rem* refertur.' [Recens refers to *time*, novum to *substance*.] Substituting νέος and καινός, we might say, 'νέος ad *tempus*, καινός *ad rem* refertur,' and should thus grasp in a few words, easily remembered, the distinction between them at its central point."

CHRONICLES.

HYMN BOOK AND SINGING.

The forty-first Annual Report of "the American Baptist Publication Society," was sent to me, by some unknown person in Philadelphia. This Society held its last meeting in St. Louis, Mo. It will be interesting to look at some of its proceedings, and the more, from the fact that we claim a near relationship with the "denomination" which it represents. I acknowledge the affinity, and believe that the blood which fills their veins, though somewhat mixed, has in it sufficient vitality to mingle, without much evil, with that which circulates through the ventricles of the heart of the Disciples.—Whether a union will ever be effected between us as a people, we know not. But it is certain, if the shore will not come to the sea, the sea will come to the shore. Whatever may be the process, we would hail with feelings of delight a still nearer approach. We can not but think that the day is not far distant, when all who accept and practice believers' immersion, will be compelled to unite on a common basis either for an aggressive or a defensive warfare. The leaven of the apostolic doctrine is working silently but effectively among the Baptists; and now and then it appears in the calling out from their ranks those who occupy common ground with the Disciples.—The controversies which have been carried on between us, both by the pen and the tongue, have not been in vain; and although there is now a temporary lull and calm in the winds theological, the Euroclydon is gathering, and if we go not into the "Fair Havens," as Paul directed, we may fall on a place where "the two seas meet," and run the ship aground and remain immovable, while the hinder parts of the vessel may be broken by the force of the waves. We can afford to wait. We have nothing to lose, and they have much to gain. Truth

has its years eternal, and is never in a hurry. The heavens above the clouds are always calm. In science and in art, as well as in religion, the assurance of hope is always present. It may be night now, but the day is at hand. Steadily the earth moves on its axis, in despite of the *decretals* of Popes and the *credenda* of Councils. It is refreshing to see how the great laws of the physical universe do their silent but efficient work, notwithstanding the ignorance and the opposition of men; and so moral and religious truth gradually wins its way into the hearts of the multitude, and darkness and blindness disappear before it. It was in this way that the Lutheran Reformation gained its triumphs, and the restoration of the nineteenth century lives to accomplish its beneficent work. All great movements affecting the well-being of the masses, meet with opposition, and come crying into existence. In due time the world acknowledges their presence, and owns them as positive entities.

I see from the Report, that the Baptist denomination, some two years since, appointed "a committee of pastors, to compile with great care a Hymn Book for social meetings." About six hundred of the choicest hymns in the language, embracing the old and familiar songs of Zion, to which are added many precious gems of modern date. The work has been issued in two forms; without music and with music.

The music has been selected by W. B. Bradbury, Esq.

It would be well for us to adopt some method of this kind in relation to our forthcoming Hymn Book. We need two books, one having the hymns, and the other having both hymns and appropriate tunes. Music in our churches is giving us no little trouble, and will continue to do it in the future. Some have thought it expedient to introduce instrumental music as an adjunct; and others have the matter under consideration, but are reluctant to take the step. It is easy for us to see that in process of time, what others have done before us, will be done by us, whatever of evil or of good may follow. Singers as a class are very testy and touchy, and extremely fond of having their own way; and good voices are not always found in our churches, or competent persons to lead in music. This will lead to the selection of those who have the necessary qualifications as an art, to take charge of the psalmody of our churches, and will be attended with all the evils incident to such conditions. For one, I shall take no offense at good congregational music, even though aided with an instrument, as I do not think that there is any sin in musical sounds, no matter where they come from. Intelligence directs the mouth, as an instrument, and so it does the organ. But I should object to either as an element of discord among us.

To meet the daily and pressing want of good music, we must have a Hymn Book with tunes; and to elevate our standard of music, greater attention must be paid to the science than has hitherto been done among us. One reason why this is now demanded, lies in the fact that music is found in nearly all of our families. Pianos, melodeons and cabinet organs are to be seen in almost every well-furnished parlor. Our daughters learn to play on them and sing in all our boarding schools, and children of both sexes are taught music in all our common schools and Sunday Schools. The musical talent of the present generation is a hundred per cent above that of the past; and as we receive into our churches new converts, they naturally expect to hear what will not offend their good taste. If disappointed, they will take no part in it, but in process of time will turn away from it. Now to meet this increasing want, and to secure their hearty co-operation, the only remedy is to bring the popular taste of our congregations up to the required standard. This is true Christian progress.—I like the word and the thing. Progress in science and in art does not consist in leaving first principles, but in following them to their highest end. Christianity anticipates all that is comprehended in the noblest advancement that we can make in civilization. It is a prophecy of the grandest type of humanity. It never grows old or *effete* amidst the march of science and art; and whilst it is never offended by any developments in matter or mind, it gives no offense by allying itself with ignorance and rudeness, or a false and vitiated taste.—Christianity never will be called a *dead past*. It outlives the dead, and has a vitality that survives whatever is local or ephemeral. Let us not confound the ages through which it has lived with that divine entity which endures and will endure forever. While we sacrifice no part of it; set aside none of its laws and ordinances; observe its worship, and hold to its doctrine, let its march be free and unobstructed, and its presence a blessing to rich and poor, to the ignorant and wise, to the learned and the rude, to the barbarian and the highest type of civilization.

No expense or labor should be wanting to improve our psalmody, and interest all in it. Our taste is more appealed to in this department of worship than any other. It is eminently social and popular, and can not be ignored without serious injury to the cause.

The pomp and splendor of the Jewish worship ceased when the Christian Institution was established. How much this was owing to the necessities of the case, and the nature and structure of the Christian religion, we cannot say. The Jewish religion was national; the Christian personal: one appealed to the senses, the other to the understanding. One was suited to infancy and childhood, the other to

spiritual manhood. The great themes of creation, providence, and redemption, give peculiar pathos and sublimity to the strains of music. Sometimes a solo, sweet or bold, expresssive of the devotional sentiments which fill the soul; and then harmony in which multitudes join in different sounds; and now the full chorus, burdening the air with the thunder of song and swelling the tide of rapturous joy—surely there is nothing so pleasing or exultant as this order of worship, or which exhibits more skill in those who practice it. If it requires mental discipline and much practice to speak well, it requires equal attention to the science of music to sing well; and the congregation should spare no pains to meet the demands of this part of worship. It has given me much anxiety; and I have seen and felt the practical working of the present condition of things in the musical department, with fear and trembling. I have confidence in the good sense, forbearance and patience of our brotherhood, and hope for the best. Whatever will lead us out of the discord both of the Press and of the voice, into the atmosphere of truer melody and harmony, I shall hail with unspeakable pleasure and delight.

JAMES CHALLEN.

THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS.

Just at this stage of the discussion as to the propriety of a Theological School, or Biblical Institute, it may be well to present a few definite statements, designed to guard against false issues and mistaken impressions. After frequent and full conference with many leading brethren who favor such an institution, we feel fully authorized to say—

1. That it is not had in view to follow the lead of other Theological Schools, in teaching *a system of Theology*.

2. That it is not meant to make preaching a *trade* or *profession*, under the idea that any young man who rather fancies the vocation, may, by a process of education, be furnished for his work.

3. That it is not intended to shut out persons of limited acquirements from the ministry, and erect an exclusive class, such as is popularly termed *an educated ministry*.

4. That it is in no sense designed to cast dishonor upon the uneducated, but godly and useful laborers, either of the past or the present, to whose self-denying toils the cause owes so much.

It is simply proposed to take young men who, like Timothy, are "well reported of by the brethren,"—whose desire to enter on this work, and whose capacity for usefulness in it, have been already tested, and give them the advantages which the learning and experience

of their seniors may furnish, to equip them for speedy and certain usefulness. Any special arrangements which may be made for such as can afford it, to pursue an enlarged course of study, so as to furnish to our people a body of learned advocates, need not and will not interfere with the more popular mode of instruction, such as the mass of young preachers need, to prepare them for prudent, consistent, and effective service.

It is meant to instruct them thoroughly in the Bible, and in such religious and literary studies as may fit them for an intelligent, dignified, and forcible advocacy of the Gospel.

In a word, it is designed to furnish them, at the outset of their career, with an amount of knowledge and experience, from their teachers, which it would require half a life-time to gather up by their own unaided efforts, and to save them the numberless errors, failures and mortifications to which youth and inexperience would otherwise subject them.

Paul proposes two objects to Timothy, of special importance: first, to be a workman who needs not to be ashamed; secondly, to know how to behave himself in the church. These may be said to be the sole objects of the proposed school—the greatest difference between the primitive school and ours being, that we can furnish no such teachers as Paul to fill any of the chairs. Yet, having the advantage of Paul's counsels to start on, it may be hoped that wise and faithful men will be able to teach others these invaluable lessons of inspired wisdom.

We have immense fields opening before us. There is room enough for all the preachers we can muster, from all sources. If churches can raise up preachers, and train them in their own midst for acceptable service, let them do so. If Evangelists can take young men in company with them, and train them in the field of active service, let the work go on. The more the better. If earnest souls, with eager desires burning as a fire in their bones, are impelled to efforts, in spite of the neglect or oppositions of churches and evangelists, until they compel a recognition of their ability and worthiness, we surely will not say them nay. More than one such brave soul do we know and honor.

But if, in addition to all these, the facilities and encouragements of a Biblical school, under the guidance of wise and faithful men, can call out and equip scores of earnest and pious young men, year by year, for the spread of the Gospel, who can object? We need *hundreds* of preachers to-day more than we have—live, earnest, wise men, who can meet the demands of the church and of the age; but who, above all things, sha' be "mighty in the Scriptures." A cry is coming

up from all parts of the land. The churches never before felt the need as they feel it now. They never were so ready to encourage and support the preaching of the Gospel, as now. Let us not fritter away our time and strength in windy discussions; but use *all* honorable means to supply laborers for the harvest. I. E.

MISSIONARY WORK.

A few moments at hand this morning is all that is allowed us to write concerning our visit to the Missionary Convention of the churches of Pennsylvania and West Virginia, held in Allegheny City, from 25th until 28th instant. This, though only its 3rd anniversary, gave unmistakable evidence, in the number of churches represented, and the liberal character of their donations, that the disciples in this section entertain a true conception of the importance of this work. The delegates present in this meeting evinced, throughout the whole proceedings, that hearty interest and earnestness which showed that there was still an inspiration in the great truths of our holy religion, and that under its influence the mind and heart are moved by the noblest aspirations. Rarely have we seen a meeting that entertained so many propositions, embracing a larger area of diversified Christian beneficence, and never one in which all measures necessary to the accomplishment of these great purposes were more readily and heartily adopted. Not only was liberal provision made, in cash donations and pledges, for the employment of Evangelists in the missionary field, but more than $1500 was raised to *sustain* and *educate* young men for the work of the ministry. This is certainly a step in the right direction, and is aimed at the root of the whole matter. As a question of political economy simply, it will ultimately prove the *cheapest* way to supply the demand, and is the *only* way to meet the requirements of the case, contemplated in reference to its social aspect. The work of conversion lies in the Word, but there must be a ministration of this Word, and for this young men must be qualified before they should or will be *sent*. That they should be educated so as to stand upon the same general plane of intelligence occupied by the mass of society, is necessary to the exertion of any beneficial influence whatever. That they must be educated in order to rise superior to this level, and thus be enabled to teach, guide, and elevate the popular mind, is absolutely essential to the exercise of that *controlling* power which must be possessed by a successful minister of the Gospel. We are not to be understood as meaning, that we would fill the mind with a knowledge of the classics, the sciences and arts, and if possible make a literary Sampson *first*, and then at-

tempt to imbue the heart with a sense of moral responsibility and the sanctifying influences of love, but we would have a *joint* development of the one with the other—a *cotemporaneous* education of head and heart. We would observe that wisdom which *shapes* the twig *while growing*, and waits not till it becomes the unyielding tree.

But to return to the meeting. We were glad to note, from all that was said and done, that there was but one sentiment concerning a concentration of our religious effort—that it should be more compact in itself, and positive in its character, especially in relation to our missionary, educational and literary schemes. In missionary operations let there be *unity* and activity; in Colleges and Female Schools, the *best possible organization* and efficient instructors; and in our editorial chairs, able and discreet writers. We said we were glad to note the existence of this sentiment. It shows that we are recovering from that error into which we as a people had partially fallen, of establishing male and female colleges all over the land, multiplying our monthlies and weeklies, and in both cases regarding number instead of merit as the true element of strength. It is a *grand* mistake to expend our money in the erection of buildings, and to divide our support and patronage among half a dozen colleges and papers, when *one* is enough, and would by reason of its individuality bring into it all of talent necessary to make it one of superior rank and excellence in every respect. Steam has removed the difficulties of distance; it is but economical and wise to elevate the type of what we have, instead of increasing the number. And when the capabilities of these are not sufficient, then it will be time enough to lay the foundation of others.

Among many preachers residing in this portion of the State, we were pleased to see the faces of others from other States, and to grasp the warm hand of some who mingled with us more than fifteen years ago, in the halls of Bethany College. Though a stranger to many, the familiar faces of Eld. D. S. Burnet, W. K. Pendleton, T. C. McKeever, A. E. Myers, B. W. Johnson, L. P. Streator, and others, the acquaintances and friends of years far back, made us to feel that we were once more at home. If any thing could have conspired more to this feeling, it was the genuine and cordial hospitality so generously exhibited by many members of the congregation in Allegheny. Though our home, during our brief stay, was at the house of our truly excellent Brother and Sister McGrew, who, with their Christian sons and daughters, are beyond all praise considerate and kind—still we were unable to refrain from enjoying, on special occasions, the hospitality of our esteemed elder and younger sister Church, and the home of our beloved brother John Scott. It was also our happy priv-

ilege, under the roof of our amiable brother and sister Bateman Goe, to spend one night in the company of his noble-hearted brother John S., whose warm hand we had last pressed 20 years ago, on the spot where I now write.

If the general interest of the meeting could have been enhanced in any way, it would have been in devoting a period of time every day to the hearing of such brief and inspiring addresses as were delivered during the last session of the convention. It would have relieved the business of all tedium, and have given new impulse to future efforts in the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Its next annual meeting will be held in the city, but not in the same Hall. The foundation of a splendid church edifice is already laid, and will, when complete, testify the liberality of those engaged in its erection. May the Lord enlarge this sentiment in the hearts of the brethren everywhere. A. A.

Bethany, W. V., Aug. 30, '65.

The Christian Ministry.—The Christian ministry may fairly be considered as constituting, in every age, the *Living Power of Reproof*, by which the constant tendency of human nature to licentiousness and corruption is to be held in check. This tendency to disorder, and this Power of repression, are antagonist forces, of which the one will rise as the other falls; or the one recede as the other advances; and which, therefore may, in their relative state of exaltation or depression, be taken as means of measurement, the one for the other.—*I. Taylor.*

Policy.—When, in obedience to certain maxims of policy or discretion, (which, however learnedly excused, fall immeasurably short of true wisdom) we step forward as the apologists of things that all right-minded men feel (whether they say so or not) to be utterly indefensible, we sever the nerve of our moral and intellectual strength, by the very act. No expectation can be more egregious than that of finding ourselves *men* to-morrow, if we must be sophists to-day.—*Ibid.*

God has called us to meet his best gift to man—his only begotten Son—not in a splendid court, but in a manger; in the wilderness; in Gethsemane; before the High Priest, where he was buffeted and smitten; at the cross, and at the sepulcher! Thus it is that he corrects the pride and ambition of the human heart

COURSE OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTION IN BETHANY COLLEGE.

DEAR BRO. FRANKLIN:—I have been gratified at the free discussion which you have allowed on the question of ministerial education, and especially to discover that while you oppose theological schools in their ordinary sectarian form, you are not opposed to a wise and well directed course of instruction for our young preachers, such as will fit them for an earlier and more efficient discharge of their duties. I have long felt a deep interest in this subject, and am happy to see that Bethany College, the great pioneer in our system of education, has organized and is prepared to carry into effect a scheme that seems to me precisely suited to cover the whole ground that we deem it legitimate to occupy on this subject. Allow me to introduce it to your readers in an extract from her last catalogue:

"COURSE OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTION.—This Department is so arranged as to accommodate, *First*, Students for the Ministry, who have only an ordinary English Education, and who do not wish to study the Ancient Languages; and *Second*, those who desire to take a more thorough course of instruction in Biblical learning.

For the former, the Course will be:

Mental and Moral Science, Belles Lettres, Logic, Evidences of Christianity, Butler's Analogy, Church Government, Sacred Rhetoric, Composition and Delivery of Sermons, Exercises in Extemporaneous Speaking, Pastoral Training, and Christian Ethics.

For Classical Students, there will be added:

The Study of the Scriptures in Hebrew and Greek, with exegetical and critical treatment; the History of the Books of the Bible; Biblical Antiquities and History; Criticism and Interpretation; Church History; History of Doctrines, and History of Polemics.

This important Department is conducted by Professors Pendleton and Loos, and it is hoped that there will very soon be such an endowment of the chairs into which it is distributed as to justify the Board in relieving them of some of their labors in the Academical Course, so that they may give a more undivided attention to the instruction of Students for the Ministry. It is contemplated, as soon as the liberality of the friends of the College will warrant the appointment, to call in additional aid to this department, and to make it, in all respects, as thorough and complete as possible."

This, I think, meets every demand, and is free from reasonable objection. It is suited both to the classical and the simply English student, and bears the impress not only of mature reflection and wise experience, but a broad comprehension of our wants and the means necessary to meet and provide for them. This old and noble Institution has done for us a great and inestimable work in the past. She has given a character to our young and rising ministry, that is a hope

and stay of the church; and now that our wants are calling for a still more thorough work in this direction, we are gratified to see her prompt to step forward and undertake it. Bethany College is emphatically the child of the Reformation. She catches and breathes its spirit as if by instinct. All our great movements find her foremost among their advocates. Quick to anticipate, she is also ever ready and able to execute the public will of our people. This is a feature of Bethany College that we cannot too highly commend; and it springs, we think, from the intimate and thorough sympathy which she cherishes with the feelings and principles of the entire brotherhood. She realizes, that her mission is not education for itself merely, but education solely and supremely for Christianity and the church. She belongs to the brethren; works for the church, and studies the wants and interests of our cause above every thing else. She allows no alloy of sectarianism in her ends or means, and hence she is justly regarded as the great mother of the system of education for which we, as a religious people, desire to be distinguished;—a system which makes the restoration of apostolic Christianity its highest aim, and the Bible its greatest means.

But I only desired to call attention to the Course of Biblical Instruction in Bethany College, and will not trespass further upon your columns. ALBERT ALLEN.

September 1st, 1865.

DISCUSSION ON UNIVERSALISM.

BELLVILLE, RICHLAND CO., OHIO, Aug. 14th 1865.

BRO. PENDLETON:—On Friday the 4th inst. closed at this place a discussion between Bro. A. E. Myers and N. R. Nye (a Universalist preacher of large caliber, and formerly editor of the Star of the West, a leading organ of the Universalist church), on the following propositions: 1st, Do the Scriptures teach the final holiness and happiness of all mankind? 2nd, Do the Scriptures teach that any part of the human race shall suffer endless punishment? Quite a number of our preaching brethren were present, among whom were C. E. Vanvoorhis, R. Moffiett, J. S. Lowe, J. W. Lowe, Bros. Reaves and Gass; also a number of ministers of other denominations, Bros. Tulloss, Morrison, Delano, and Osborn, (Baptist); Bros. Fairchild, Ball, and Redding, (Methodist); Bro. Fouts (Lutheran); and Bro. Darling, (Presbyterian). The discussion was attentively listened to by a large audience for four days, and a great interest was manifest which grew as the discussion progressed. Mr. Nye started off with great self-assurance, making his strong fortifications on outside is-

sues, trying to mystify the minds of the people, and evading the main point in debate. The two first days he spoke very fast, and with great warmth, but the two last days he became very much exhausted, both in argument and physical energies, his voice having failed so that it was difficult for him to speak so as to be heard by the audience. It was the lion turned to the lamb. Bro. Myers commenced very calmly and deliberately, and grew stronger and better, as the discussion progressed, always commanding that dignified and gentlemanly deportment which should ever characterize the Christian. He was sound and convincing in his arguments, logical in his reasoning, and correct in his conclusions, and left an influence in favor of truth that I trust will result in much good to the cause of Christianity. It was a signal triumph of truth over error. To the Lord be all the praise. Yours in hope, J. H. Groves.

ORDINATION OF ELDERS AND DEACONS.

Bro. Pendleton:—In one of your articles you say, "The ceremony, then, of formally setting apart evangelists, by the imposition of hands, was most clearly performed by the eldership, and we know of no reason why it should not be so now."

By whom, then, shall the ceremony of formally setting apart the elders and deacons, by the imposition of hands, be performed?

S. W. H.

Ans.—The order in this case will depend somewhat on circumstances. If the elders and deacons to be ordained are conveniently located to other churches, they may be ordained by the elders of these churches; if remote from any existing organizations, as in the case of the congregations in Crete, then an evangelist may be sent or called in, specially for the purpose, after the example of Titus, i. 5 or of Paul and Barnabas, Acts xiv. 23. We have no example mentioned in the New Testament of elders ordaining elders, but they ordained evangelists, who ordained elders, and the general principle clearly warrants the inference, which is confirmed by history, that they also ordained elders. W. K. P.

On the Death of young Children.—Ephemera die all at sunset, and no insect of this class has ever sported in the beams of the morning sun! Happier are ye, little human ephemera! Ye played only in the ascending beams, and in the early dawn, and in the eastern light; ye drank only of the prelibations of life; hovered for a little space over a world of freshness and of blossoms; and fell asleep in innocence before yet the morning dew was exhaled!—*Richter.*

LETTERS TO LITTLE ONES.

It has been a long time dear children since your old Friend has written to you. He has many cares, and may have seemed to have forgotten you—but not so. You are ever dear to his heart, and he addresses you again through the Harbinger to present to you a sweet little token from a dear friend, which comes from the far off land of New South Wales. It has been a long time coming and you see is in answer to my letter of June 1864. You must ask your teacher to show you on the map where Sydney is, and to trace out for you the stormy sea voyage that it has had to make in order to reach you, and then you will know, why it has been so long in reaching me. You see what a far-off place your good example has reached, and should thank God that you have been able to do some good at so great a distance from your own land and home. It is sent to your dear Uncle Philoneus, but you see it is addressed to you. It begins—

"To the dear little ones who love to read the Harbinger.

My Dear Little Friends:—It makes my heart happy to know that you have a kind Uncle Phil. who tries to please you by writing you such nice letters. It is very kind of him, but he is only doing what Jesus would have him to do, for Jesus loves little children and wishes to make them happy.

I am going to to tell you about a Sunday School that we have here in Australia, right opposite to where you are, only the world is between us. Our feet point to your feet, our summer is your winter and our winter is your summer, and our day is your night. The seasons and a great many other things are contrary here to what you have in America. But it is our Sunday School I wish to write about just now; but if any of you would like to hear more about this strange country you must let me know when you write to uncle Phil. There is a wild bush place where you can neither see houses nor huts until you are quite close to them, the "scrub" is so thick—not many miles from the large and wealthy seaport town of Sydney, New South Wales. A short time ago a footpath led to it, but strangers could not find it; so out of the way was it, and so hidden by the wild bush, that people who lived but a short distance from it knew nothing about it.

Well in the houses or rather huts that dotted this place were little children just like you, only they had no Uncle Phil. to write to them, no school, no teacher, no meeting house, no minister.

Now there is a road all the way from the shore to this spot, and the first thing you see as you come near to where the houses are, is our large brick school-house; as it is high itself, and stands on high

ground, it is seen through the bushes and trees before you reach it. About forty children attend Sunday school clean and neatly dressed. We have a superintendent who comes out from Sydney every Sunday. We have teachers from the day school, [we have a large day school.] These children and teachers made the superintendent a present of a very handsome desk well furnished, a short time ago. They were puzzled for some time what to buy,—I helped them to decide. They asked me to buy it for him. So we had a meeting on a week night and invited the Superintendent out from Sydney to present him the desk with a very pretty address that one of the teachers wrote and the children put their names to it. How happy they were to give the present, how pleased was Mr. G. to receive it. We were all pleased. Yesterday being Sunday I read Uncle Phil's. letter in the June 1864 No. of the Harbinger about the Bethany children bringing others to school, and little Jamie D. who brought the big bare-footed boy to school, who afterwards became a preacher. When I said the Bethany children were little missionaries my children looked puzzled, and so they might, for they thought I meant them. Now the reason of that is, our school is called Bethany school, and the children who attend are the Bethany children. They were delighted with the letter and asked me to say something for them to Uncle Phil.

One little fellow said "I yike e yettle" [I like the letter]; Fanny said I like the Bethany children; Maggie said I will try and do what the Bethany children do, bring others to school; Lottie said I will try and do as little Jamie did and meet him in heaven; Sarah said I like to come to school to learn good; Mary said I will try and love Jesus and be good; George, Eddie, James, Willie and Robert all said they would try to follow little Jamie's example.

I asked them if they could tell me where Bethany W. Va. was. They said it was in West Longitude and North Latitude a long way from here, but Uncle Phil's letter made them think it was not so far away.

Now my dear children go on to be good and do good, for your example may be followed by children in this far, far away place.

Farewell, God bless you all prays the children's friend,

E. D.

He that prays out of custom or gives alms for praise or fasts to be accounted religious, is but a Pharisee in his devotion, and a beggar in his alms, and a hypocrite in his fasts. But a holy end sanctifies all these and all other actions which can be made holy, and gives distinction to them and procures acceptance.—*Jer. Taylor.*

THE SONG OF LIGHT.

From the quickened womb of the primal gloom
The sun rolled black and bare,
Till I wove him a vest for his Ethiop breast,
Of the threads of my golden hair;
And when the broad tent of the firmament
Arose on its airy spars,
I penciled the heaven's matchless blue,
And spangled it round with stars.

I painted the flowers of the Eden bowers,
And their leaves of living green,
And mine were the dyes in the sinless eyes
Of Eden's virgin queen;
But when the fiend's art in the trustful heart
Had fastened his mortal spell,
In the silvery sphere of the first-born year,
To the trembling earth I fell.

When the waves that burst o'er the world accurst
Their work of wrath had sped,
And the Ark's lone few—so tried and true—
Came forth among the dead;
With the wondrous gleams of my bridal dreams,
I bade their terror cease,
And I wrote on the roll of the storm's dark scroll,
God's covenant of peace.

Like a pall at rest on a senseless breast,
Night's funeral shadow slept—
Where shepherd swains on Bethlehem plains
Their lonely vigils kept;
When I flashed on their sight the herald bright
Of heaven's redeeming plan,
As they chanted the morn of a Savior born—
"Joy! joy! to the outcast—man!"

Equal favor I show to the lofty and low,
On the just and unjust descend;
E'n the blind, whose vain spheres roll in darkness and tears,
Feel my smile, the blest smile of a friend;
Nay, the flower of the waste by my smile is embraced,
As the rose in the garden of kings;
At the chrysalis bier of the worm I appear—
And lo! the butterfly wings.

From my sentinel steep by the night-brooded deep,
I gaze with unslumbering eye,
While the cynosure star of the mariner
Is blotted out from the sky;
And guided by me through the merciless sea,
Though sped by the hurricane's wing,
His compassless, lone, dark weltering bark,
To the haven home safely I bring.

I awaken the flowers in their star-spangled bowers,
The birds in their chambers of green,
And mountain and plain glow with beauty again,
As they bask in their national sheen.
Oh! if such be the worth of my presence on earth—
Though fitful and fleeting the while—
What glories must rest on the home of the blest,
Ever bright with the Deity's smiles!—Wm. Pettit Palmer.

QUERIES.

1st. "What was the *attiude* assumed by Christ and his apostles during the eating of the Paschal Supper, and during the eating of the Lord's Supper?"

Ans.—We learn from Matt. xxvi. 20, Mark xiv. 18, and Luke xxiii. 14, that the attitude assumed was the ordinary one assumed at feasts —they *reclined*. The common version represents them as *sitting*, but both the Greek words ανακειμαι, αναπιπτω (*anakeimai* and *anapipto*) mean to *recline*. The fashion was, to lean upon one elbow, and stretch the body and limbs outwards, so that the head of one guest approached the breast of another—their faces being turned toward the table.

2nd. "What *attitude* was assumed by the Apostles and early Christians in the celebration of the Supper?"

Ans.—This question cannot be answered by an express declaration of Scripture. The New Testament gives us no express declaration on the subject. But the earliest light of antiquity is, that they partook of it standing. As St. Austin expresses it, "*Stantes orarum, quod est signum resurrectionis,—We pray standing, which is a sign of the resurrection.*" "Standing," says Bingham, "was the general observation of the whole church on Lord's day and the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, in memory of our Savior's resurrection. This custom may be traced as high as Ireneus, A. D. 167, who derives it from apostolic authority. For the author, under the name of Justin Martyr, gives this account of the use of both postures (kneeling and standing) in prayer: Forasmuch as we ought to remember both our fall by sin, and the grace of Christ, by which we rose again from our fall; therefore we pray kneeling six days, as a symbol of our fall by sin; but our not kneeling on the Lord's day, is a symbol of the resurrection, whereby, through the grace of Christ, we are delivered from our sin, and from death, that is mortified thereby. And this custom took its original from the time of the apostles, as St. Ireneus says in his book concerning Easter, wherein he also makes mention of Pentecost, during which time we kneel not, because it is of the same nature as the Lord's day, according to the reason that hath been given. Not long after, Tertullian speaks of it as an observation, among many others, handed down from the ancient tradition. At the time of the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, some diversity seems to have grown up in the practice of the church, and that Council decreed that,—"Because there are some who kneel on the Lord's day and on the day of Pentecost; that all things may be uniformly performed in

every parish or diocese, it seems good to the holy synod that prayers be made to God standing." And this it appears they did, with their faces turned towards the East.

3rd. "What attitudes have been commonly assumed, as shown by the history of the church?"

4th. "What attitude is now most appropriate throughout the ordinance of the Lord's Supper?"

Ans.—Standing and kneeling have both been practiced, and as the highest authority seems to be traditional, we are left in great measure to the guidance of the general rule that all things should be done decently and in order. Still, as Ireneus was a disciple of Polycarp, who is supposed to have been cotemporaneous with some of the apostles, and therefore had an opportunity of learning from him their custom, we may consider that the force of tradition is on the side of standing, at least during the act of prayer. Whether this attitude was observed, also, while partaking of the elements, is a question not so clear, but the authority of tradition rather favors this view of the subject. Kneeling, however, became also very common at a later day. For my own part, I am perfectly well satisfied with our custom of standing during the thanksgiving, and sitting whilst partaking of the elements. As to sitting during prayer, it is uniformly condemned by the primitive church, as irreverent and utterly disrespectful of the proprieties of all true worship. W. K. P.

Let no man despair of God's mercies to forgive him, unless he be sure that his sins are greater than God's mercies. If they be not, we have much reason to hope that the stronger ingredient will prevail, so long as we are in the time and state of repentance, and within the possibilities and latitude of the covenant; and as long as any promise can but reflect upon him with an oblique beam of comfort. Possibly the man may err in his judgment of circumstances; and therefore let him fear; but, because it is not certain he is mistaken, let him not despair.—*Jer. Taylor.*

Hope and fasting are said to be the two wings of prayer. Fasting is but as the wing of a bird; but hope is like the wing of an angel, soaring up to heaven, and bears our prayers to the throne of grace.—Without hope it is impossible to pray; but hope makes our prayers reasonable, passionate, and religious; for it relies upon God's promise, or experience, or providence, and story. Prayer is always in proportion to our hope zealous and affectionate.—*Ibid.*

BETHANY COLLEGE.

This Institution is located in one of the most beautiful and healthy portions of the hill country of West Virginia. It is in Brooke county, *sixteen* miles north of Wheeling, and *seven* miles from Wellsburg, at which place, persons coming either by boat or rail, can find hacks ready to take them to the College. Situated as it is in the country, it is removed at once from the temptations to extravagance, and the facilities for vice, which attach to Colleges in or near large cities. Young men who desire a thorough education will find peculiar advantages in Bethany College. She has an experienced faculty and affords the best education on the lowest terms.

The 25th Session will commence on the 1st Monday in October next and terminate on the last Thursday of June, 1866.

FACULTY.

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, President.

W. K. PENDLETON, Vice President and Professor of Mental, Moral, and Political Philosophy and Belles Lettres.

CHARLES LOUIS LOOS, Professor of Ancient Languages and Literature.

B. W. JOHNSON, Professor of Mathematics and Astronomy.

R. RICHARDSON, Professor of Natural Philosophy, Chemistry and Natural History.

TERMS.

Boarding, from $4,00 to $5,00 per week.
Tuition, per session of 9 months $50,00.
Washing and lights extra.
Matriculation Fee $5,00.

For Catalogues or Further information address W. K. Pendleton, or C. L. Loos, Sec'y.

In laying before our readers the foregoing announcement for the 25th Session of Bethany College, we beg leave to add, that the Steward's Inn has been thoroughly repaired and will be kept in the best style. Besides this, many families in the village have made preparations to receive boarders and lodgers, and thus it is hoped that all can be accommodated. We confidently expect an unusually large attendance, and students will do well to come promptly at the time of opening, or to engage their rooms in advance. They may thus avoid the disadvantage of the last choice.

We congratulate the friends of the College on the return of Dr. R. Richardson to the Faculty. He was one of the *first* Faculty ever formed in Bethany College, and has been engaged as a teacher for a quarter of a century. He has won and justly deserves a place of highest distinction among us as an educator, and is especially emi-

nent in the Department which is now committed to him in Bethany College.

In the foregoing announcement, no mention is made of the course of Biblical Instruction which is provided for students for the ministry, because it is *extra* of the regular Literary and Scientific course: but it will be sufficiently explained in the article which we give in this number of the Harbinger addressed to Bro. Franklin, and from the pen of Brother A. Allen. W. K. P.

A QUESTION.

Bro. Pendleton:—Does the word "Christ" in Hebrews xi. 26, refer to him who was crowned and consecrated, "anointed with the oil of joy above his fellows"—"made Lord and Christ," after his resurrection and ascension as announced by the Holy Spirit through the apostle Peter at Pentecost, or does it refer to the people of God, the descendants of Jacob mentioned in the verse above? Upon the hypothesis that it has reference to the Divine Redeemer, the King of glory—where could Moses have gained so accurate and clear a knowledge of the seed of the woman who was to bruise the serpent's head? Was it not long centuries after Moses, that the Prophets foreshadowed the "suffering of Christ and the glory that was to follow," which they themselves could not comprehend, and which even angels desired to look into? If, however, it refers to the descendants of Israel, would it not have been better on the part of our translators and revisers not to have anglicised but to have translated the word "anointed," the anointed ones meaning the Jewish People.

W. H. W.

Ans.—The word Christ in this case we think clearly refers to our Savior. The passage does not require us to suppose that Moses had any very accurate knowledge of the "Seed of the woman that was to bruise the Serpent's head." His Theocratic hope involved this though he did not fully understand it—and the apostle to whom it was fully revealed, speaks of it as then understood to him. What enabled Moses to endure reproach, involved and really contained this promise of the Christ—and knowing this fully, the apostle so explains it—not as seen by Moses, but as now unfolded, as to Moses and Elijah in the transfiguration, so more fully to the apostles and other disciples after the resurrection.

It will not do to understand "the anointed" as referring to the Jewish people, because it is in the singular number, του χριστου, the Christ—the anointed *One*—not the anointed *ones*. W. K. P.

GOOD WORDS FROM OUR CORRESPONDENTS.

Bro. Pendleton:—The mails are bearing to me good news from all parts of our State. The labors of Brethren B. Franklin, Wm. M. Roe, Wm. McIlvaine, Sheperd, B. C. Sherman, R. A. P. Buchanan, J. L. Martin, D. Nation and J. Blackenship have resulted in 245 added to the church of our blessed Redeemer. In the last two months over fifteen hundred dollars have been received to aid the good work. We hope to have a great meeting at Indianapolis beginning October the 10. We hope to see many preaching brethren from other States with us. Pray for us. In hope,

Indianapolis, Ind. R. L. Howe, Corresponding Secretary.

Bro. Pendleton:—We rejoice with all the people of God, at the success of the truth in all parts of our land. The labors of brethren T. Lockhart, B. C. Sherman, W. S. Patterson and myself have resulted in 50 additions to the army of our great King. We hope *many* of our brethren from all the States will come over and enjoy with us our State Meeting beginnning October 10. During the last two months $1,800 has been raised for our Mission. R. L. H.

Austin, Minn., June 27, 1865.

Bro. Pendleton:—Please publish in the "Harbinger" that the next Annual Meeting of the Minn. Christian Co-operation will be held in Morristown, Rice co., Minn., commencing Thursday Sept. 14, 1865.

Dear brethren of Minnesota, let me earnestly exhort you to spare no pains to make our 3rd Anniversary the most interesting ever held in our State. And will not the good Brethren in older States remember us in our isolated condition? Yours for the spread of a pure Gospel,

A. P. Frost, Cor. Sec'y.

OBITUARIES.

Died, at his residence near Bethany, W. V., July 28th, 1865, Robert Gibson, aged 46 years. A lingering decline confined him to his room for the greater portion of six months. His suffering, though not severe, was attended with great debility; but he maintained to the last his unswerving confidence in the Savior.

He was born in Ayrshire, Scotland, and emigrated to the United States in the summer of 1849. He was connected with the church at Newton Stewart for 6 or 7 years, and with the church at Bethany for 16 years, having served acceptably as a deacon for the last 9 years.

He was highly esteemed by the community for his industry, probity, and benevolence, and much appreciated for his strong good sense; and by the church, for his uniform goodness of life, and his zeal for good works,

He leaves a widow and eight children to follow his example, and treasure his memory in their hearts. May they all be enabled, by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, to meet him in Heaven! J. A. C.

Died on the 12th of August, 1865, Sister Margaret Clark, wife of Bro. J. A. Clark of Wilson co. Tenn. She was for many years a member of the church at Alexandria, together with her husband, and died in the triumphs of the faith. She leaves six children and her husband, with a circle of dear friends and brethren to mourn her loss. The rewards of the righteous be hers. P.

CHRISTIAN HYMN BOOK—NEW EDITION.

This new book will be ready for sale by the 20th of September. It is about fifteen years since the book now in use was revised, and the long use of the stereotype plates has worn them until they are unfit for further service. Valuable as this selection was at the time it was made, there has been for years quite a general conviction, especially among our preachers, that many valuable hymns were not included in the book; and that some that were, could be spared—that the wants of the Christian churches required a book of more extent and greater range of subjects—a book in every respect equal to the best extant.

This feeling had become so general that it was obvious a new book would be produced. It was probable that, if left to individual enterprise, several books would be the result. It is very desirable that our churches everywhere have a common Psalmody. To secure this result, Bro. A. Campbell, at the solicitation of quite a number of the leading brethren from various States, donated the copy-right of the Christian Hymn Book, in trust, to a committee of five, chosen by himself and the brethren attending the Annual Meeting of the American Christian Missionary Society, in October, last year. This committee was to arrange for the publication of a book, the matter of which was to be prepared by another committee, of the same number, chosen in the same way. The latter, or editing committee, are Isaac Errett, W. K. Pendleton, W. T. Moore, T. M. Allen, and A. S. Hayden. The publication committee consists of R. M. Bishop, C. H. Gould. W. H. Lape, O. A. Burgess, and J. B. Bowman.

The profits of the book are to be paid into the Treasury of the A. C. M. Society, and to be devoted to the spread of the gospel.

These committees proceeded immediately to their work, and the book is nearly completed. The labor of the editing committee has been a considerable tax on their time, and has been facilitated by the aid of other competent brethren, especially by Bro. William Baxter, who generously gave into their hands much matter previously selected by him.

The Committee of Publication, in announcing the new book, is gratified to be able to say that, in the judgment of various brethren who have been able to examine the copy for the book, and in their own, the material for the work has been so carefully selected and classified, that it will meet the approval of our brotherhood generally.

The plates are cast from new type, and are sharp and clean. The book will have 1,323 hymns and 840 pages, being more than twice the matter of the old book. The prices for the first edition will be seen in the advertisement of the Publisher.

The Committee having ascertained the exact cost of manufacturing the Hymn Book, solicited proposals for its publication from several leading houses east and west. The most favorable of these propositions, and one regarded by us as entirely satisfactory, was made by H. S. Bosworth, of Cincinnati. An agreement has therefore been made with him to manufacture and supply the book on terms and at prices fixed by the contract, with a provision for the reduction of rates in future, as book material and labor decline.

R. M. BISHOP.

CINCINNATI, Aug 25th, 1865. *Chair'n of Com'e for Pub'n.*

☞ For prices of new Hymn-book see cover.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 36.] BETHANY, W. V., *OCTOBER*, 1865. [No. X.

EXTREMES.

We have never known so general and earnest a demand for preachers and teachers as at the present time: not only for Evangelists to occupy the inviting fields that are opening on every hand; but, in the churches also, for Teachers, to educate and foster the communities which have grown too large, and feel their wants too seriously, to be longer satisfied with the partial supervision and instruction of former times. Experience—the best of teachers—has demonstrated the necessity of at least one in every eldership who can devote himself exclusively to the interests of the church, and be indeed a shepherd to the flock. In many churches there is not sufficient material for an efficient eldership. In many others, brethren who are competent to the task, are so absorbed in secular pursuits as to be unable to do for the churches what they are abundantly qualified to do, in the way of instruction and discipline. Very generally, too, there are outside attractions to lure the young, and outside oppositions to intimidate the weak; so that without special protection and guidance, many are drawn away, or driven back from their steadfastness. The churches, therefore, are loudly demanding more diligent and effective pastoral care. We have no work on hand of greater moment than that of furnishing to the churches, from within or from without, a sufficient number of competent instructors, to bring up the eldership to a respectable standard, for competency and efficiency.

But in this, as in all other matters, we are in danger of extremes. While we rejoice in the indications every where abounding, of a greatly increased interest in the churches, in the matter of church ed-

ification, we see, in several directions, a tendency to a dangerous extreme, which it is best to notice in time.

No sooner does a church wake up to the necessity of more preaching and teaching, than they determine to be satisfied with nothing short of the very best preacher in the field! Every place is, to those who live there, the center of the world. We very seldom find a church which, when seeking either evangelical or pastoral labor, does not put in a special plea of "very important place," "very intelligent community," or "very strong opposition," as a basis for a demand of the very best talents and the most popular gifts that are to be found. The place is, or is soon to be, the most thrifty in the land; the people are the most intelligent, and have been accustomed to hear the best preachers; a few of the greatest men in the State live there, and have been heard to express a desire to hear some "big gun" from our ranks; or, the other churches in the place have their most eloquent ministers stationed there, and none but a first class preacher can meet the demand. There are so many of these *most* important centers, with the *most* intelligent population, and the *grandest* preachers, and the *ablest* men of the State or of the nation living in them, that if you accept all the statements as canonical, you cannot help concluding that the center of the world is everywhere, and its circumference nowhere. The result is, that while many churches are languishing, waiting for the *best* preachers, many *good* and *useful* preachers are unemployed, because they cannot "fill the bill."

Now we have no intention to attempt the ungrateful task of destroying the happy conceit which every one is apt to entertain of the superiority of his chosen locality. It is a very pleasant, and, on the whole, a very innocent conceit. We rather like the strong and earnest attachment—the *inhabitiveness*, as a Phrenologist would say—which binds a man with enduring affection and solicitude to his own home and his own community. He who does not strongly love his own home, his own friends, his own church, his own chosen neighborhood, cannot be trusted to cherish a strong affection for other homes, other friends, other churches, or other communities. He who easily breaks these ties, deserves little confidence. The *home* verities, and what we call the *selfish* feelings, are, after all, largely the basis of all reliable social virtue and religious fellowship. But there is no need to be foolish over it, and allow these local attachments to overshadow entirely the claims of the rest of mankind. The interests of the cause of Christ are common and universal interests.—If, in any thing, we may be expected to rise superior to selfishness and local narrowness of sympathy and effort, it is in seeking the universal spread of the gospel of the grace of God.

But this desire for the *best* preacher, and this neglect of good and holy men, for the lack of brilliancy, involves several mistakes, which we really think we are doing a kindness to point out.

First—It is a mistake that *oratorical* superiority is that which is most essential to a church's prosperity. If we were going to enumerate the failures in pastoral work that have come to our knowledge, quite a large proportion of them have been among men of superior merit as orators. But the *law of love*, in this as in all else that pertains to the church's welfare, is the rule of success. He is the most acceptable man in the pulpit, who has been with us in our temptations, sicknesses, sorrows, and reproaches, and by a daily life of love and sympathy has endeared himself to our hearts. There is a charm in the tried sincerity, in the known worthiness of the speaker, which lends the power of eloquence to the commonest utterances of one who is beloved for his works' sake—compared with which the most fascinating speech of an unloving or unsympathizing nature is but as "sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." So says inspiration, and so says experience. This will be found true, not only as it relates to church members, but also as it relates to outsiders. They will respect and admire the candid, honest utterances of an earnest *worker*, who *wears well* as a man and as a Christian, far more than the brilliancy of the mere orator, whose strength is entirely in his pulpit ministrations. What the churches want, is godly, earnest *workers*, whose daily life is a constant sermon of beauty and power; men who spend much of their time from house to house, among the sick, the poor, the wandering; who are busy in the prayer meeting, the Bible class, the Sunday School; men who are prudent and religious, and sociable in their daily intercourse, and enter into every good work cheerfully. If to all this, they add oratorical power, so much the better. But without high excellence in that department, such men will succeed in acceptable and useful pulpit discourse.

Secondly—It is a great mistake to suppose that the possession of the best pulpit talent is the great desideratum for the church. It will be an evil day for any church when such a sentiment shall prevail.—The object of pulpit instruction is not to remove from the members of a church to the shoulders of the preacher, the responsibility for the church's prosperity; but on the contrary, to increase the sense of responsibility among the members. It must never be forgotten that the entire brotherhood of Christians constitute God's anointed priesthood—a priesthood which they cannot surrender at will to the preacher.—The presence of a preacher or teacher in their midst, is but to quicken and rouse them, severally, into a nobler individual life, and, aggregately, into a more harmonious and efficient church-life. The preacher's

power will be seen mainly in the more harmonious and energetic development of spiritual life in the membership; and the *love, holiness, energy, and benevolence of the church, is that which must captivate and convert the world.* A church whose members are willing to work, can succeed with a teacher of moderate ability; a church which relies on the eloquence of their preacher, would fail if an angel from heaven were their preacher.

Thirdly—It is a mistake that a good man of respectable attainments, must succumb to the popular cry for an orator. It is largely as a church wills about this. If they show confidence in and respect for their preacher, and the community see that he is beloved and honered by them, it will go far to create a reputation for him in society: so far, indeed, that if, with this advantage, he fails, the failure is most probably his own fault. When churches cry out against their own ministers, and underrate them in comparison with others, it is too much to expect that the men thus undervalued by their own people, can secure general respect.

Finally—It is a fatal mistake to judge a man simply by his power to please—for there are fastidious tastes, and false tastes, and corrupt tastes to gratify, which ought rather to be the condemnation than the commendation of the preacher. We have known men whose sterling integrity would not allow them to stoop to cater to the passion or prejudice of the hour—men trembling under too deep a sense of accountability, to be guilty of degrading their calling for popular effect, who never could be as popular as others of more elastic principles, and greatly inferior worth. And it is an unrighteous and cruel thing, when that lofty integrity which a church should honor as the brightest jewel in her teacher's character, so far from commending him to her love, becomes the reason for sacrificing him to the demands of a temporizing policy, or to the unfavorable criticisms of a corrupt world. Men may well tremble to commit their reputation to a church's keeping, when they witness the readiness to yield to popular clamor—when, in fact, a man is to be judged by the popular voice, and not by his real merit. The devil could ask no greater favor of the churches, than that they would allow the voice of worldly applause to decide on the merits of her preachers and teachers.

Let the churches seek for pure, earnest, laborious men, of respectable ability and attainments, who can bring into the pulpit the weight of a reputation honestly earned in their daily labors out of the pulpit. They will find that piety is worth more than rhetoric; that sincerity and consistency, are the best logic; and plainness and simplicity of speech, backed by the power of a loving life, will more than supply the lack of rounded periods and artful declamation.

No one, of course, will understand us, in all this, as attempting to cast discredit on oratorical excellence. Oratory is a grand power.—We have use for all we can command of it, in our ranks. We only mean to argue that a man may be a useful preacher and pastor without being an orator, and that there is "a more excellent way" to meet the wants of our churches than a mere reliance on oratorical attractions.

We had intended a few hints on some extremes to which preachers are liable, but these must wait for another opportunity. I. E.

Aphorism.—A peasant may justly believe what a philosopher cannot explain. For example philosophers puzzle themselves exceedingly, to say wherein consists the identity of a human being, taken only at short intervals of time; but the most ignorant man knows that his neighbor, whom he has seen frequently for sixty or eighty years, is the same man that he was at first. So it is with many points of common belief, or even of religious faith; an ignorant man may have the certainty of truth about them, while the learned are frittering away all proper thoughts of the same, and depriving themselves of the most real advantages offered them. The unlearned passes safely over a bridge, while the speculative man refuses to cross till he knows the history of the structure, and gets more than the evidence of the senses that it is there at all.

Now the truth is, the principle of faith, or the habit of resting upon testimony, is one that ought to go much farther with mankind than any merely rational calculator will allow. Reason has its own sphere, and that a most important one; but where questions of ontology or substantive being are concerned, we must walk in a great measure by faith—ultimately faith in God.—*N. Y. Observer.*

Let the fond admirer of his own church, whatever may be its pretensions, assure himself, that the conversion of Asia and Africa, Europe and America, will so raise the temperature—spiritual and moral, of the world's atmosphere, as must dissolve, to its very elements, every community now calling itself a church. All principles shall then invest themselves in new power, all notions of good and evil be recast, all forms and constitutions be new modeled. We shall indeed believe the same things as now; but in another manner: we shall practise the same virtues, but a different rate with firmer motives, and under the guidance of an extended exposition of every precept.—*Isaac Taylor.*

AN "UNSOUND ARGUMENT" TESTED.

In the Harbinger for March there is an article entitled "Unsound Arguments in support of Truth." In the April No. this is succeeded by another article by the same writer. I do not regret the appearance of these articles; nor can I say that I am satisfied with the disposition the writer makes of the examples introduced. There is this gained by their appearance;—We are led to re examine the foundations of our old, and with some, perhaps, favorite arguments, and if they are actually found to be imbedded in the sand, let us abandon them and seek those only that are founded upon a rock. Truth needs no false supports, nor can it be conveyed to the mind or enforced by false arguments.

The writer has adduced four examples illustrative of unsound arguments. I have no partiality for them, as I do not remember of ever having used any of them; but I have never regarded them unsound. The attempt to make them appear inconclusive is by no means convincing. The effort to expose the flaw only discloses the pure metal.

In the *Review* of June 20th there appeared an article by Bro. Mitchell calling in question the correctness of the strictures in reference to the illustration,—the genuine and counterfeit bills. The rejoinder to this article is worthy of notice, but we leave it with Bro. Mitchell to reply, as he has already shouldered the responsibility. The generosity of my former teacher will certainly not regard me immodest or presumptuous in not yielding implicit confidence to all he has said on this subject. With his permission, then, I will examine the first argument introduced which he pronounces unsound.

The object of this argument is to disprove that sprinkling or pouring is baptism. It is stated thus: John the Baptist could not have sprinkled the people in the Jordan, for sprinkling is predicated only of water, sand, ashes, and such like substances; and as John could not handle the people in this way, sprinkling is not baptism; for surely he did not sprinkle the people into the Jordan."

This argument is purely philological. Its validity depends solely on the acceptation of the word sprinkle. The meaning of this term is determined by the laws of the English language, irrespective of the theological controversy about baptism. We need not the aid of Hebrew, Greek, or Latin, in settling this point. Our standard English lexicographers are amply sufficient. As English scholars, then, as English grammarians, we ask, What is the meaning of the term sprinkle? Is it admitted that "Sprinkling is predicated only of water, sand, ashes, and such like substances."? It seems to be in the above

statement; I shall hence take it for granted. Stating the argument as concisely and connectedly as possible, we can the more readily perceive its validity or detect its fallacy. It is in the form of an enthymeme, the major premise being suppressed. It presupposes that people or persons are not "water, sand, ashes, or any such substances." But "Sprinkling is predicated *only* of water, sand, ashes, and such like substances." Therefore sprinkling is not predicated of people or persons. This is a necessary inference. Again, if sprinkling is not predicated of people or persons, they cannot be sprinkled; therefore "John could not have sprinkled the people in the Jordan." Once more: Baptism is always predicated of persons: Sprinkling is never predicated of persons: therefore sprinkling is not baptism. The conclusion, it seems to me, is inevitable. Let Bro. Munnell, or any one else, point out any error in reasoning if he can, for we do not want the argument if it is false. I am not unaware of the fact that there is a slight ambiguity in some of the terms. Some of them are not defined, and some not distributed. But it can be seen at a glance that the sense in which the term is taken, can easily be established. For instance, it is asserted that baptism is always predicated of persons; but here Christian baptism alone is meant, and not a baptism of cups or pots. But he who takes advantage of such ambiguities, will only exhibit his adroitness at the expense both of his candor and logic.

This argument has been pronounced unsound because it is liable to objections. An opponent quotes Moses and Paul and exultingly reports a victory. Moses says: "The priest shall sprinkle the house seven times." Paul says: "Moses sprinkled both the book and all the people; he sprinkled with blood, both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry." But do these passages invalidate the reasoning? I think not. It is the province of logic to determine the correctness of the reasoning, and to this we appeal. If our inferences are correctly drawn, and our conclusion at variance with any declaration of the Bible, there must be some error in the premises. Granting as we have done that "Sprinkling is predicated only of water, sand, ashes and such like substances," the conclusion is a necessary result. Whatever discrepancy there may be between the statement of Paul or Moses and our conclusion, arises in this admitted premise and pervades the whole argument. We must then make a new survey and determine the correctness of our observations.

Is it true that "Sprinkling is predicated *only* of water, sand, ashes, and such like substances"? Had it been said that sprinkling is predicated of water and sand &c., we would have been at liberty to predicate it of other substances. But the word "only" limits it to such

substances as water, sand, ashes. It excludes "the book" and "the people," "the house" and "the tabernacle." As philologists, then, we are to ascertain the meaning of the term sprinkle as used in the English language. Sprinkling is "the act of scattering into small drops or parcels," says Webster. The verb sprinkle scatters or separates into parcels the substance which is the object of the verb.—This is invariably the case. "Moses sprinkled ashes toward heaven," "blood upon the altar," "sprinkle the water of purifying upon them," &c. The idea of dispersion is always found in the word; it must, therefore, be confined to substances that can be dispersed or separated into parcels. Our premises, then, are true, and our conclusion established.

But how do you explain the fact that "Moses sprinkled both the book and all the people." Moses did not do it. But Paul says so. Let Moses explain himself. "And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people (Ex. xxiv. 8). It is the blood that is sprinkled and not the book nor the people. By metonymy Paul puts the object upon which the substance is sprinkled for the sprinkled substance. This is a figure constantly occurring and well understood in common parlance. When we say "the kettle boils," we mean the water boils; we do not boil potatoes, but we boil the water to cook potatoes; dying bed means the bed on which a person dies; we do not sprinkle clothes, but water upon the clothes. There is no trouble in understanding such expressions on any subject but religion. Here there is so much wrapt in mystery, language seems to be so indefinite that "we can not understand it alike."

But we are told that "the argument is based upon the assumption that the metonymy is not an allowable trope." Is it? Candidly, does Bro. Munnell really think so? Will he reaffirm this assertion? The fact is, the argument is entirely independent of this assumption. The argument is valid whether the assumption be true or false. It is only by means of this trope that we are enabled to set aside the trivial objection against this argument.

Possibly our very cautious brother will say, you have given the enemy the advantage,—you have given him the handle while you hold the blade. If I have, let my head be severed, let me die. But how is it? In this way: "If Moses literally sprinkled the people why could not John do the same?" A sage question, truly, for a scholar. A tyro could respond, If Moses did not, *as he could not*, sprinkle the *people*, then John did not, and *could not*. This is the true state of the case—as admitted by Bro. M. in the next sentence, though he has glossed it over by introducing the words "really," and "with blood," and by changing the expression so as to toggle up a tottering ob-

jection. He continues: If Moses did not really sprinkle them with blood, then the language must mean that he sprinkled blood upon them." Exactly. Then Moses did not sprinkle the people, but the blood. The phrase "with blood" is but an accommodated expression to supply the ellipsis which is the object of the verb. Again he says: "So it might be said of John that he sprinkled water upon them—baptized them with water, sprinkled them with water as Moses did with blood; that is sprinkled water upon them." It was not intended, of course, to insert the absurdity of this reasoning; this is wisely omitted, but it must be exposed. As John baptized the people with water, "it might be said" (?) that "he sprinkled them with water as Moses did with blood." How is that? By metonymy. Hence it would be by metonymy that John sprinkled them, or baptized them, i. e. he did not sprinkle or baptize them at all,—but sprinkled water upon them, baptized water upon them. Hence it would follow that the water is baptized and not the people. "Thus it is plain" that this argument in favor of immersion does not injure the truth, but establishes it; but should never be used by a man who aids his antagonist in filing objections.

We know that Bro Munnell does not believe that sprinkling is baptism any more than it is immersion. But why does he assist his opponent in urging a weak objection against a valid argument, as though an objection to an argument necessarily rendered it invalid? True, it may sometimes; But objections there are to all arguments, which may be true nevertheless. Establish the logical sequence of the propositions; then state fairly and strongly the objections and remove them, not leave them to stumble over. We do not doubt immersion to be baptism because of the difficulty of immersing three thousand in one afternoon; nor do we doubt either the rotation of the earth or the authenticity of the Bible, because people say, "the sun rises," and Joshua commanded the sun to stand still upon Gibeon. No doubt Bro. Munnell has often encountered these objections, and is thoroughly capable of converting the mountains into molehills.

Pompey, Aug. 1865. W. W. Hayden.

Estimate of the Learned Selden.—"I have taken much pains to know everything that was esteemed worth knowing among men: but of all my disquisitions and readings, nothing now remains to comfort me at the close of life but this passage of St. Paul: 'It is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners;' to this I cleave, and herein I find rest."

FRAGMENTARY PRAYER.

[From "THE STILL HOUR," a small work on prayer, by Austin Phelps, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary.]

"*A devout man, one that prayed always.*"—*Acts* x. 2.

We miss very much devotional joy, by the neglect of *fragmentary* prayer. In the intervals which separate periodical seasons of devotion, we need a habit of offering up brief ejaculatory expressions of devout feeling. The morning and the evening sacrifice depend very much upon these interspersed offerings, as these in return are dependent on those. Communion with God in both, is assisted by linking the "set times" together by a chain of heavenward thoughts and aspirations, in the breaks which occur in our labors and amusements. Sunrise and sunset may attract our *attention* more strongly than the succession of golden rays between them, but who can say that they are more cheering? It is not often that a day wholly clouded lies between two clear twilights.

Prayer, as we have seen, is, in the highest conception of it, a *state* rather than an *act*. A full fruition of its benefits depends on a *continuity* of its influences. Reduce it to two isolated experiments daily, and separate these by long blank hours in which the soul has no glimpse of God for its refreshment, and how can prayer be other than a toil, and often a drudgery?

We come to the eventide with the impression of the morning watch all obliterated; probably with a conscience burdened by accumulations of sin upon an ungoverned spirit during the day. We feel that we must take a new start every time we seek God's presence. Our sense of spiritual progress is lost. Sinning and repenting is all our life; we do not have holy force enough to get beyond repentance in our devotion. Our prayers, instead of being, as they should be, advancing steps, are like the steps of a tread-mill. Humane law has abandoned this, even as a punishment for felons; why should one whom Christ has made free inflict it upon himself?

We need, then, something that shall make our prayerful hours support each other—the morning tributary to the evening, and the evening to the morning. Nothing else can do this so naturally as the habit of ejaculatory prayer. The *spirit* of prayer may run along the line of such a habit through a lifetime. So, one may live in a *state* of prayer, "a devout man that prays always."

Not only does this habit of fragmentary prayer contribute to a lofty, devotional spirit, but such a spirit demands it for its own indulgence.

It is characteristic of minds which are aspiring in their piety, and which have begun to reap the reward of arduous devotional culture, to be habitually conversant with God. Such minds are constantly *looking up*. In the very midst of earthly toils, they seize moments of relief, to spring up to the eminences of meditation, where they love to dwell. In the discharge of duties most unfriendly to holy joy, they are apt to experience a buoyancy of impulse towards a heavenly plane of thought, which it may even require a power of self-denial to keep down.

Critics have observed, that in the apostolic epistles, doxologies are sometimes embedded in passages of remonstrance and of warning. It should seem, that the apostolic mind came down unwillingly, or from a sense of duty only, to deal with the sins and weaknesses of earth; and was on the watch for chances to rise, like a bird let loose, though but for a moment, into the upper air.

Such is the nature of holiness. Being *from* God, it is ever seeking to revert to its source. The heavier the pressure of a mundane life upon it, the stronger is the force of its compressed aspirations.—Such pressure is like that of the atmosphere on water, which seeks, through *crevices* in its enclosure, the level of its fountain. A spirit like this, I repeat, will *demand* the habit of fragmentary prayer for its own holy indulgence; and will demand it with an importunity proportioned to the superincumbent weight of earthly cares.

The providence of God, also, contemplates these impulses as a counterpart to certain of its own procedures.

Under the laws of Providence, life is a probation; probation is a succession of temptations; temptations are emergencies; and for emergencies we need the preparation and the safeguard of prayer.—We have duties which are perilous; we meet surprises of evil. We struggle with a wily adversary. We feel perplexities of conscience, in which holy decision depends on the mind we bring to them. We encounter d sappointments which throw us back from our hopes rudely. We have difficult labors, in which we sometimes come to a "deadlock;" we know not what to do. We have an *unknown* experience opening upon us every hour. We are like travelers in a fog, who cannot see an arm's-length before them. Providence is thus continually calling for the aids of prayer; and in a soul which is keen in its vigilance, prayer will be continually responsive to providences, often anticipative of them.

The methods of the Holy Spirit also, presuppose the value of these fragmentary devotions. God often secretly inclines a Christian's heart to engage in them.

Are there not, in the lives of us all, moments when, without the formality of retirement to the closet, we feel *disposed* to pray? We are conscious of special attraction towards God. Perhaps with no obvious reason for "looking up" now more than an hour ago, we *do* look up. "We feel *just like praying.*" It is as if we heard heavenly voices saying, "Come up hither."

There is often a beautiful *alliance* between Providence and Grace, in these experiences. A Christian who will be studious of his own history, will probably discover, that often the *occasions* for such fragmentary communings with God follow hard upon these secret incitements to them. Emergencies come soon for which they are needed. The Holy Spirit has anticipated them, and sought to forearm us.—Providence and Grace thus hover over us, not far asunder.

In this view, those Biblical exhortations to prayer, which men have sometimes deemed extravagant, are transparently rational: "*Continue* in prayer;" "Continue *instant* in prayer;" "Pray without *ceasing*;" "Men ought *always* to pray;" "*Rejoice* in the Lord *always!*" Such exhortations contemplate a state, not insulated acts, of prayer. They *fit in* well, to the system of things in which we are living; for, that system seems, on all sides of it, to presuppose just this continuity of unpremeditated ejaculations, joining together our stated seasons of devotion.

No Christian, then, can afford to be frugal of prayer, in the intervals of daily business and amusement. Enjoyment of *all* communion with God must be impaired, by the loss of these little tributaries.—A Christian's life, so conducted, must languish as a tree does, whose fibrous roots are stripped off, leaving only its truncal root, possibly only a tap-root, for its nourishment. That Christian is hoping against impossibilities, who thinks to enjoy a life of intercourse with God, in any such way.

We are opposing God's method of working, if our life has a tendency to incapacitate us for the enjoyment of prayer *at all times.* If by needless excess of worldly cares; if by inordinate desires, which render it impossible to accomplish objects in life *without* such excess of care; if by frivolous habits; if by the reading of infidel or effeminate literature; if by an indolent life; if by any self-indulgence in physical regimen—we render the habit of fragmentary prayer impracticable or unnatural to us, *we are crossing the methods of God's working.* Something has gone wrong, *is* going wrong, in the life of that Christian who finds himself thus estranged from filial freedom with God.

Such a Christian must, sooner or later, be brought back to Christ, and must begin life anew. He will come back heavy laden and in

tears. No words express more becomingly the wail of his spirit, whenever he comes to his right mind, than the plaint of Cowper—

"Oh for a *closer walk* with God!"

In the vestibule of St. Peter's, at Rome, is a doorway, which is walled up and marked with a cross. It is opened but four times in a century. On Christmas Eve, once in twenty-five years, the Pope approaches it in princely state, with the retinue of cardinals in attendance, and begins the demolition of the door, by striking it three times with a silver hammer. When the passage is opened, the multitude pass into the nave of the cathedral, and up to the altar, by an avenue which the majority of them never entered thus before, and never will enter thus again.

Imagine that the way to the Throne of Grace were like the *Porta Santa*, inaccessible, save once in a quarter of a century, on the twenty-fifth of December, and then only with august solemnities, conducted by great dignitaries in a holy city. Conceive that it were now ten years since you, or I, or any other sinner, had been *permitted* to pray; and that fifteen long years must drag themselves away, before we could venture again to approach God; and that, at the most, we could not hope to pray more than two or three times in a lifetime! With what solicitude we should wait for the coming of that Holy Day!—We should lay our plans of life, select our homes, build our houses, choose our professions, form our friendships, with reference to a *pilgrimage* in that twenty-fifth year. We should reckon time by the openings of that Sacred Door, as epochs. No other one thought would engross so much of our lives, or kindle our sensibilities so intensely, as the thought of Prayer. It would be of more significance to us than the thought of Death is now. It would multiply our trepidations at the thought of dying. Fear would grow to horror, at the idea of dying before that year of Jubilee. No other question would give us such tremors of anxiety as these would excite: "How many years now to *the* time of Prayer? How many months? How many weeks? How many days? Shall we live to see it? Who can tell?"

Yet, on that great Day, amidst an innumerable throng, in a courtly presence, within sight and hearing of stately rites, *what would prayer be worth to us?* Who would value it in comparison with those still moments, that—

—— "secret silence of the mind,

in which we now can "find God" *every* day and *every* where? That Day would be more like the Day of Judgment to us, than like the sweet minutes of converse with "Our Father," which we may now

have, every hour? We should appreciate this privilege of *hourly* prayer, if it were once taken from us. Should we not?

"Still with Thee, O my God,
I would desire to be;
By day, by night, at home, abroad,
I would be still with Thee!

With Thee amid the crowd
That throngs the busy mart—
To hear Thy voice, 'mid clamor loud,
Speak softly to my heart!'

CHRONICLES.

PREJUDICE.

"Apologists had paid too little attention to the *prejudices* of their opponents, and had been too confident of accomplishing their object at once, by an overpowering statement of the direct evidence, forgetting that the influence of prejudice renders the human mind very nearly inaccessible to both evidence and argument."—*Dr. Inglis*, "*Vindication of the Christian Faith.*"

If this is true with regard to the subject of Christian Evidence and anything connected with Theology, as proper themes for discussion, with men of high philosophical repute, who reject the whole subject from the domain of thought, as unworthy if not above or beneath the the consideration of the students of nature; what shall we say of those specific matters, which are fully believed by us, but which are rejected with disdain by others professing to be the followers of Christ. Some of our opponents admit that what we teach, is found in the New Testament, and belonged to the infancy of the Christian Faith, and was inseparable from it; but that the church was in its minority and was subject to the leading strings of childhood. They say that the vestments in which it was clad were coarse and fitted only for infancy, and that the church has outgrown what was suited to the early times, and has adapted itself to higher forms of the Divine life. We do not speak here of miracles, gifts, and signs, such as belonged to the creative age of Christianity, which necessarily appealed to the supernatural rather than the providential, but to the principles of the Christian religion as a system, when fully developed.

We know what results have followed from this concession to Infidelity. It has yielded up everything into the hands of the opponents of Christianity, and has opened the flood-gates not only of Deism, but Atheism and Pantheism, all of which are pouring their turbid waters into the sea of Spiritualism.

That the whole question of a supernatural revelation has been ignored and rejected, as the legitimate result of scientific thought and speculative reasoning, is certain; and the literature of the day and the public discussions, both with the pen and the tongue, show that the "progress" of the world is towards a religion of sense, and not of faith—of science to the rejection of Revelation.

He who yields up any one distinctive feature of the Christian faith, has in his own heart the *virus* of an unbelief, that will, if not checked, lead him to surrender all that belongs to it. We must take it as a whole or not at all. This applies particularly to those who make Christianity a subject of strict analysis and patient study. Many there are who undoubtingly receive all that our Savior taught, as they do the universe that God created, and find no room for scepticism. They are like the ten disciples who saw the Lord after his resurrection and believed. But now and then a Thomas will be found, who without demonstration refuseth to believe. What would have become of him if the Savior had not shown him his hands and his feet. He might—he would—have drifted away on the sea of unbelief. The blessedness of a faith without sight, is not appreciated or understood in this our day, and yet it is of its very essence. It has to do with the unseen. In the very presence of Christ it found the invisible and adored it. There was much in the outward and the sensible in the Nazarene, to question the faith of his first adherents. It was not easy to overcome the preponderating effects which appealed so strongly to the *prejudices* of the ancient nation. To see through that humble form,—that lowly Galilean—"the expected one" of Israel, was a great achievement. It required an eye of faith, keen as the arrows of light, to penetrate through the thick veil that hid him from the nation. Only the telescope can separate the suns and systems from the dim and uncertain haze of "the milky way" in the distant heavens. It is probable, that among all his followers, none had so clear a vision as John the beloved disciple, and Mary, who sat at the feet of Jesus. I think it is probable, perhaps certain, that the unbelief of many in this day in regard to the plain teachings of Christ is owing to the same cause which prompted his rejection by the Jews. It is not so much for want of sight as from *hating* it when seen. It is not additional sight, they need, but a disposition to accept what they see. Too much sight quenches the organ of sight and leads one to turn away from the object revealed. A thousand fold more evidence could have been given for the truth of Christianity, but it would have been at the loss both of reason and judgment, and the sacrifice of all true manhood. Our faith is not a necessity but a *choice*. It is not the result of a mathematical

demonstration but of historic evidence, and to be willing to believe is one of the conditions of its existence. Unwelcome truths always encounter opposition. It is not so difficult for the mind to accept the truth that "Jesus is the Christ" as to do the things that he commands in order to salvation. Any truth that involves a complete change in our moral character and life, finds a counterpart in our will, and this must be subdued and controlled. The many controversies with "the sects" on the great questions at issue between us, have done but little towards their conversion. Not that they have failed in convincing thousands and silencing our adversaries; but they have left the parties where they have been, in array against us.

The root of this opposition in many instances has struck deeper in the ground. It is buried in the soil of *prejudice*. Is there no way left us, to pull it up and cast it away; or to so manage the soil that it cannot find subsistence and must perish?

Our baptist brethren have adopted a most unwise expedient, to conciliate their opponents. They have reduced the ordinance of "believers' immersion" to an unmeaning rite, and of most uncertain value, in their dogmatic teachings, and yet make it the *sine qua non* of church communion. This has rendered the ordinance among its friends a matter of indifference, and shorn it of its importance, without allaying the bitter prejudices of the Pedo-baptists against them.—*The less value, they attach to it, the greater the fanaticism in making it a bar to communion!* Conciliation has awakened contempt, and placed them on a lower level than the weakest of their opponents. This is unfortunate for them and for the truth. Nothing will ever bring in a "revival" among the Baptists or restore them to power, but the advocacy of the true design of Baptism. I would speak this boldly in their ears. We are more respected by our adversaries than they, for the reason, that we attach, right or wrong, more importance to the Institution than they do; and have good reasons for our adherance to what we deem to be the truth. I would advise all their preachers to devote one year to the study of this one question, "What is immersion administered for, to a penitent believer."

Let every one who can reach the conclusion of Peter, Acts ii. 38, or Paul, Acts xxii. 15, preach it—faithfully and fully, and the results will be glorious. But why do I speak thus. The *will* is wanting. The incurable *prejudice* is in the way; and yet in some cases it has been overcome, and it may be in others. Let us hope for the best.

JAMES CHALLEN.

The most beautiful hand in the world is the one that gives to the poor.

ABOUT COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS FOR PREACHERS.

It is very gratifying to see the interest that has of late been awakened among the brethren on the subject of calling out and preparing men for the ministry. A great necessity pressing upon us of the work of evangelization and edification, at home and abroad, a deep realization of this necessity, and clearer views of the work of the ministry and of our duties in that direction, lie at the bottom of this auspicious awakening. Let us accept it and bless it as the work of God, of his good Spirit among us; and above all, let us earnestly address ourselves to this work, and see to it that whatever we do in this direction be done promptly and wisely, and in perfect harmony with the word and the spirit of the Law of Life.

We are uttering only what every thoughtful mind knows, when we say, that when a new movement like this is inaugurated, there is always inevitably a tendency to go to extremes, especially when, as in this case, it is accompanied and ushered in with much controversy and opposition; in this conflict, and by the very novelty of the scheme, such a momentum is acquired that is always likely to carry the project beyond the proper limits and barriers. Wise and prudent and very deliberate judgment, therefore, should preside over the planning, the inauguration and execution of such an enterprise, that the proper measures only be adopted, and the true end only be attained.

Schools for the education of the ministry are no new thing; nor do they belong to our modern age only. Nothing is more natural in the history of Christianity, than the demand for and origination of these. It is an old idea, an old institution, met with everywhere in the ages and lands of Christendom. This, it might be supposed, should put the question as to the ends to be reached and the methods to be adopted beyond controversy; as already settled for us by the past among *others*. We are unwilling, however, to accept any such law for ourselves. It is our duty as men and Christians not to despise and reject the experiences and teachings of the past. This would be a foolish and a criminal error. The past, in all that it has experienced, in all it has done and brought forth, has a very deep significance, and is a very rich legacy to us. It should be highly appreciated, and profoundly studied. According to the wisdom of an ancient sage, in going forward we should also look back. But to adopt the examples of others before us, in matters like the one in question, as established, accepted precedents, will not do for us; it is not in harmony with the great religious work in which we are engaged.—

All great questions like these will have to be studied by us anew and from the beginning. Our religious work is a peculiar one. Let us not fail to recognize this, not only in the particular work of preaching the gospel, but also in that part of public education committed by Providence into our hands and assumed by us, and also in the special work of educating the preachers of the Word. It is to this two-fold question, therefore, just stated, that we propose to devote this article; and the object of our preliminary remarks will be seen as we proceed.

That there should be the freest and fullest opportunity offered for the liberal education of the ministry among us, is a conviction, we think, now so general with the brotherhood, that it may be accepted as definitely agreed to. Opposition to this will not be able long to maintain itself; it is too unreasonable, too much in league with the powers of ignorance, of the darkness of mind, to stand long before the broad light of Heaven and of human experience. But the questions yet involved in this matter, and yet to be sifted and determined, are many and serious ones. Much can be learned from a full discussion of the subject, but we presume actual experience will also have to teach us much. It is of great importance, however, that a good beginning be made, or else a good work may fail seriously and be set back for a long time. To this end several important practical points will have to be understood and determined. To some of these we now invite the attention of the reader. These will involve not only the particular matter of ministerial education, but necessarily also, that of our system of general collegiate education.

We can best introduce what we desire to say in this discussion, by referring to the fact, that one of the leading questions that have arisen in the controversy on the subject of schools for preachers, is, whether such schools should be separate institutions, or connected with our colleges. This is a point of much practical importance, as experience will certainly demonstrate. It is a question vital both to our colleges and to the schools for preachers, on the character and fortunes of both of which its final decision will have a great and enduring influence. This, we think it is not difficult to show. Conscious of no bias but what the premises fully justify, we declare it as our decided conviction, *that no schools for ministerial education should be established apart from our colleges.* The reasons for this conviction we propose, as briefly as possible, now to lay before the reader. In doing this, we shall be necessarily led to speak of our colleges, as to what they ought to be, to answer the great end designed by their establishment; a subject, we think, that now also earnestly demands the attention of our people.

To separate ministerial education from the colleges, would at once lower the character of these institutions in the very particular in which they ought to stand the highest. It would take from them that which ought to be, and really is, their chief strength and excellence. It would make them precisely what so many others, indeed most of others, in the old world and the new, in the past and present, have sunk to, and precisely what it was, and we trust still is, our aim they should not be,—namely, *profane* institutions. This effect would be certain, and it would be fatal to their character and usefulness. We use the word *profane*, of course, in its best sense, as contradistinguished merely from *religious*. Against such an inevitable result we protest with all our might. The establishment of our colleges, as Bethany for instance, was with special reference to the one end of educating men for the ministry of the Word; and this has ever been the great plea in their behalf before our brethren, and the strongest power in securing their endowment. Taking Bethany for example, we know whereof we affirm when we say, that it never would have been what it has been, nor done what it has done, had it not always been held up before our people as the efficient means of bringing up among the brethren an educated ministry. Take away this plea, and the great argument in its behalf is no more; and so of our other similar institutions. There is no sufficient reason for multiplying, at an immense cost, colleges and universities, merely to teach the profane arts and sciences, so called, when the land has already many, and unexceptionable institutions of this kind in it. We have first class institutions in our land where the arts and sciences are taught in a masterly way, and these not of a sectarian cast. If the business of our colleges is simply to teach literature and science, Greek and Latin, Chemistry and the Philosophies, Logic and Rhetoric, &c. &c., their mission is ended, in our judgment, and the chief ground of their distinctive existence is taken completely away. Those who say, let the colleges teach Greek and Latin, and let us have separate theological schools to teach theology, think little how deeply they at once lower the character and mission of the colleges. The only justifiable reason for our people erecting and endowing colleges, is, that they shall be peculiarly, and in the very highest sense, religious institutions,—sacred to Religion and the Arts. We say Religion and the Arts; for we would have religion always first, as the ruling, all inspiring, all-sanctifying power, and the whole circle of human sciences but its handmaid. This should be the great life-law of *our* colleges. To educate men for God, in the interests of this world and the next, should be their distinctive task, their high aim, their peculiar glory and renown. We insist upon this. An un-religious, a so-called, and

properly so-called, *profane* education, is a curse, and has terribly proved itself so. We protest against any system of education, in all the departments of which true religion does not take the lead and reign supreme. Let the State and the world do as they please, in this respect, we cannot alter that; but when *we* have systems and institutions of our own,—our own creation, under our control, then let us realize the only true Christian idea of education, that in which God and Christ reign supreme. Many among us will have yet to be educated up to this true idea of a Christian education, we well know.

In *our* institutions there should not be an element that is profane, either in the professors, the methods, or the elements of education.—The men who have by their liberality and labors reared these institutions, should insist upon it, that the true idea be realized. They should demand that the professors all, without exception, be men of God, in the highest sense of that word. None others should have the power of forming and moulding the minds and hearts, and the future lives of our young men, which the professor's chair so mightily wields. There is no other place that puts so much formative power into a man's hand, to be wielded for good or evil, as the professor's chair.—In the lecture rooms are gathered together, year by year, a large number of young minds, the select of the land, ardent and keen with desire to learn and to be influenced, full of reverence and esteem for learning and talent, looking with hungering and thirsting minds and hearts to the professors. These professors have daily intimate intercourse with them as direct instructors; they influence them by their methods, by their ideas generally, and by their entire example, as any one class of men rarely influences another. What a power for good is here, and what an equal power for evil! As are the schools of a people, especially its leading educational institutions, so will the mind of that people be. The professor that will for a course of years teach a class of students any science in an irreligious, or *un*-religious way, will make these young men irreligious just so far, and perhaps give a fatal bias to their whole tenor of thought and life. Few inexperienced in this are aware of the full and terrible truth that lies in this statement. The universities of Europe have precisely in this way ruined that land, and sown broadcast the seeds of infidelity. In America the same effects are already visible. It is a fearful thing to present a course of instruction for months and years to susceptible, eagerly receptive minds and hearts in a cold, un-Christian, if not anti-Christian and profane manner. How often in this way has an early, blessed piety, a tender, ardent love of God and Christ, a noble impulse and devotion to a life of sacrifice to the gospel, been first chilled, then changed into indifference, and finally thoroughly killed

in the soul. Often a single professor has thus sown the fatal seeds of ruin for years through hundreds of hearts. We could cite notable instances of this, both in the old and the new world. Men of false religious views, or of no religious views, or mere indifferentists, are fatal to our literary institutions; the true idea of a *Christian* education, as we alone ought to conceive of it, utterly forbids the presence of such men as teachers. With the utmost frankness and boldness we declare this, because we know it to be not only true, but a truth also of most vital importance. But, furthermore, not only should every professor be a true man of God, a man full of the Holy Spirit, but his teaching, in whatever department he may labor, should be sanctified, should be pervaded by the word and spirit of the gospel, should minister daily to the great truths of Christianity. Can this be done? We answer, Is there anything beautiful, true and good in this whole wide world, in nature, or in the history of humanity, that does not glorify God, and minister to the truths of the Bible? He that does not know this and feel this; he that cannot lead minds to see this, is not fit to be a teacher of men. His teaching will be false and destructive to the minds, the hearts and lives of men.

We repeat it, then, that the peculiar aim in our institutions of learning is and ought to be, to make them first and chiefly, religious; that is, not only holding forth doctrinally the truths, but also cultivating and establishing the spirit and life, of the gospel, and that all else should be subservient and secondary to this. The college should be a schoolmaster, indeed, to lead men to Christ. This should not only be the pretense, the name, of the college, but also the real life; not only in a sluggish, feeble way, but manifested most diligently and actively. The professors, one and all, should study and labor with the utmost diligence to show themselves workmen that need not be ashamed, thus showing themselves worthy of the high and earnest trust, and the anxious hopes, reposed in them by the people who have chosen and honored them with this high confidence. And to our people,—to the men who have labored to rear these institutions,—we say, See to it that the men to whom you have committed this trust fulfill the good pleasure of your will and purposes in this respect.—Look earnestly to it; keep your eyes on it. Demand that our colleges shall be really all this that they were designed to be, that they claim and ought to be. To the Boards of Trustees we would especially say this; and, as it more intimately concerns us, we address these words with particular earnestness to the Board of Bethany College, now so well constituted, to work with one desire, with one mind and heart in this direction. To answer the plea we are making against any separation of ministerial education from our colleges, they must

be what our idea demands. And to have it as a peculiar, prominent mission of these institutions to educate men for the work of the gospel, will necessarily lead to the selection of the men fit for the task, and also breathe by the very process of the work the true spirit of an evangelical life throughout the whole. But this, the greatest end to be secured, without which the very existence of these institutions cannot be justified, and the blessing of God cannot rest upon them, will be fatally imperiled by plucking from them their chief crown, and lowering them to the common level of mere literary and scientific institutions. In conclusion thus far, we finally appeal to the spiritually enlightened, the earnestly pious and zealous of our people: Would you be satisfied to bring our colleges down to this secondary rank, to this lower level? We are confident that even the advocates of separate schools for the ministry, will say with us, No! We ask you then to ponder what we have thus far said. For ourselves,—we say it most emphatically, with the sacred vow upon our heart, which we shall try to bear as a holy trust, unbroken, to the grave, to give our life in its full integrity to the work of the gospel,—we never can consent to spend our life and strength in a work so lowered from its holy elevation. If we are merely to teach Greek and Latin,—select some one else for this; as for us, we will go and preach the kingdom of God.

But we have said enough for this number; and leave the further discussion of this subject for the next. C. L. L.

Is the conversion of the world in question?—We have then before us, *first* a practical, and then a theoretic subject of inquiry. And in reference to the former, no difficulty can be started. The duty of every Christian to promote piety within his family—and his neighborhood, is unquestioned; and the most distant missionary enterprise (if prudently undertaken and conducted,) is nothing else than an extension of the charity which we severally owe to our neighbor. A village of England, and a village of India, are the same in the sight of Christian zeal; if it comes within our power to convey to the inhabitants of either the knowledge of God and his Gospel.—*Isaac Taylor.*

Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave, whither thou goest.—Eccl. ix. 10.

PROGRESS OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

The first number of the *Catholic World* contains a paper from E. Rameau, a French writer, giving the results of his inquiries into the condition and prospects of the Roman Catholic church in the United States, during a visit made to this country in 1860. It is important as presenting the observations of an intelligent traveler, made from the Roman Catholic standing-point. His reasonings may be partial, his estimates exaggerated, and his hopes somewhat extravagant.—Yet, making all necessary abatement for his prejudices, we think there will be found enough sober facts to startle Protestant readers, who are apt to imagine that the strength of the Catholic popultaion is to be found in a few large cities. We call special attention to a summary of the facts and reasonings of this writer which we herewith present:

The first bishop in the United States was appointed in 1789 at Baltimore. Four years afterward, another see was erected at New Orleans, La., which, ten years later, became a part of the United States; and in 1808, so rapid had been the Catholic development, that three new bishops were consecrated—one for Louisville, Ky., another for New York, and the third for Boston, Mass. While in 1789, in a population of 3,000,000, there were about 30,000 Roman Catholics, one bishop, and 30 priests, in 1808, there were 4 bishops, and 68 priests, and 100,000 members. In 1830, there were 13 bishops, and 232 priests. In 1840, 16 bishops, and 482 priests. From 1840 to 1850, 17 new sees were erected; mostly in the North and West.—In 1850, there were 1800 priests. Ten new sees were established between 1850 and 1860, eight of these being in the North and West. In 1860 there were 43 bishoprics, and 2,235 priests. The number of members is not so easily reached. But our author, partly from the estimates of intelligent Protestant writers, like Dr. Baird, partly from reasonings of his own on the relation between the number of the faithful and the number of the priests, and partly from official documents, concludes that in 1860, the Catholic population of the United States was 4,400,000. "In 1808, the Catholics were 100,000 in a total population of 6,500,000, or 1-65th of the whole; in 1830, they were 450,000, in 13,000,000, or 1-29th of the whole; in 1840, 960,000 in 17,070,000, or 1-18th; in 1850, 2,150,000 in 23,191,000, or 1-11th; and finally in 1860 they were over 4,400,000 in 31,000,000, or 1-7th of the total population. It thus appears that for fifty years the Catholics have increased much faster than the rest of the inhabitants, and especially during the last two decades. Between 1840 and 1850 their

ratio of increase was 125 per cent., while that of the whole popula tion was only 36; and 1850 to 1860, their ratio of increase was 109 per cen.t, while that of the whole people was 35. 59. These figures, to be sure, are not mathematically certain, for they are deduced partly from estimates; but we are confident that, considering the imperfect materials at our disposal, we have come as near the exact truth as possible, both in the ratio of increase and in the total population. Official returns in the British Provinces confirm our calculations in a most remarkable manner; and we believe that, estimating the future growth on the most moderate scale, *the Catholics will number in* 1870 *one fifth of the whole population, and in* 1900 *not far from one third.*"

We are inclined to suspect some extravagance in these and similar estimates of the numerical strength of the Roman Catholic church. Mr. Dieterici, the great statistical authority in Europe, estimates the number of Roman Catholics in the world at 162,500,000. Yet it is said that according to a census of the communicants, taken in Rome, in 1864, by counting the wafers consumed at Easter of that year, throughout the world, the number of communicants was found to be but 30,000,000. Yet we must admit, in the case of M. Rameau, that, having official data as to the number of priests, and official documents from the British provinces showing the relation between the number of priests and the number of church members, his reasonings appear to have a sound basis, and his conclusions are well nigh demonstrative.

In attempting to account for this mighty increase, M. Rameau fails to find a satisfactory solution in European emigration. "Immigration has never furnished more than six or seven per cent. of the decennial increase of the population of the United States, the growth of which has been at the rate of thirty-five per cent. during the same period.—Immigration, therefore, only contributed to it one-fifth. Again, of these immigrants, including both Irish and Germans, not more than one-third have been Catholics." He specifies two other causes.

"1. The Catholics are principally distributed at the North among the free States, where the population increases much faster than it does at the South; and the Catholic familes, it has been observed, multiply much faster than the others, in consequence, no doubt, of their more active and regular habits of life, sustained morality, respect for the marriage tie, and regard for domestic obligations.

"2. Another cause of increase is the conversion of Protestants—a cause which operates slowly, quietly, and at first imperceptibly, but with that constant and uniform power—reminding us of the great operations of nature—which is almost always the sign of a providential

agency." These conversions he attributes, 1. To the power of the Roman Catholic priesthood, in their superior intellectual and spiritual ministrations. 2. To mixed marriages, which, he says, "generally turn out to the advantage of the church, especially in the case of educated people in the upper ranks in society." 3. To "the excellent houses of education, directed by religious orders." His reasonings on this point are worthy of especial attention. "If elementary education is almost universal in the United States, it is nevertheless true that the higher institutions of learning are exceedingly defective.—The colleges and boarding-schools founded under the direction of the Catholic clergy, though inferior to those of France in the thoroughness of the education they impart, and the amount of study required of their pupils, are yet vastly superior to all other American establishments in their method, their discipline, and the attainments of their professors. The consequence is that they are resorted to by numbers of Protestant youth of both sexes. No compulsion is used to make them Catholics; no undue influence is exerted; the press, free as it is, rarely finds excuse for complaint on this score; *but facts and doctrines speak for themselves.* The good examples and affectionate solicitude which surround these young people, and the friendships they contract, leave a deep impression on their minds, and plant the seed of serious thought, which, sooner or later bears fruit. * * * * In fine, those who have been educated at Catholic institutions are less prejudiced and better prepared for the action of divine grace, which Providence may send through any one of a thousand channels."

In view of the rapid strides of this church, in our country, and its avowed hostility to the fundamental principles of our government, it behooves all good men to keep a watchful eye upon its movements.—We do not desire to act the part of an alarmist—much less to cherish the spirit or speak the language of bigotry or intolerance. Viewing the Roman Catholics merely as a religious body, we say that if, in an open field and a fair fight, they can bear the palm of victory away from Protestants, let them have it. If Protestants, untaught by their defeats as to the folly and wickedness of their needless party strifes, persist in the suicidal madness of sectarian ambitions and rivalries, let them be involved in the ruin which their own blindness and perverseness shall occasion. But we cannot view the Roman Catholics as *merely* a religious body, striving for spiritual mastery in a free country. That church is the embodiment of politico-ecclesiastical tyranny, in doctrine, spirit and life. We cannot forget the dark and bloody Past, in which she still glories. We cannot be blind to the uniform tenor of her history, as the champion of the most odious principles of tyranny, and practices of cruelty. If we ever so

much desire to cherish the charitable hope that she will slough off the dead past, and come up to the demands and spirit of this age and country, she crushes all our hopes in renewed and shameless utterances of the worst doctrines of the dark ages.—The readers of the Harbinger have been furnished with extracts from the last Encyclical letter of the Pope, as well as from various approved Catholic Journals. We desire, in closing this article, to place on record another testimony, clipped some years since from the *London Rambler*, a Catholic paper:

"CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

"It is difficult to say in which of the two popular expressions—'the rights of *civil* liberty,' or, 'the rights of *religious* liberty'—is embodied the greatest amount of nonsense and falsehood. As these phrases are perpetually uttered, both by Protestants and by some Catholics, they contain about as much truth and good sense as would be found in a cry for the inalienable right to suicide. That Protestants and men of the world in general should besprinkle their oratory and writings with such tinsel, is hardly to be wondered at. But how can it be justified in the case of Catholics, who are the children of a church which has ever avowed the deepest hostility to the principle of 'religious liberty' as necessarily a blessing to all? How intolerable it is to see this miserable device for deceiving the Protestant world, still so popular among us! We say, 'for deceiving the Protestant world'; though we are far enough from implying that there is not many a Catholic who really imagines himself to be a votary of 'religious liberty,' and is confident that if the tables were turned, and the Catholics were uppermost in the land, he would in all circumstances grant others the same unlimited toleration he now demands for himself. Still, let our Catholic tolerationist be ever so sincere, he is only sincere because he does take the trouble to look very carefully into his own convictions. His great object is to silence Protestants, or to persuade them to let him alone; and as he certainly feels no personal malice toward them, and laughs at their creed quite as cordially as he hates it, he persuades himself that he is telling the exact truth when he proposes to be an advocate of religious liberty, and declares that no man ought to be coerced on account conscientious convictions. The practical result is, that now and then, but very seldom Protestants are blinded, and are ready to clasp their unexpected ally in a fraternal embrace.

"They are deceived, we expect, nevertheless. Believe us not, Protestants, for an instant, when you see us pouring forth our liberalism. When you hear a Catholic orator at some public assemblage, declaring solemnly that 'this is the most humiliating day of his life, when he is called upon to defend once more the glorious principles

of religious freedom,' be not too credulous. These are brave words, but they mean nothing: no, nothing more than the promise of a candidate to his constituents on the hustings. He is not talking Catholicism, but Protestantism and nonsense; and will no more act on these notions in different circumstances, than *you* now act on them yourselves in your treatment of him. You ask, if he were lord in the land, and you were in a minority, if not in numbers, yet in power, what would he do to you? That, we say, would entirely depend on circumstances. If it would benefit the cause of Catholicism, he would tolerate you; if expedient, he would imprison you, banish you, fine you; possibly he might even hang you. But be assured of one thing—he would never tolerate you for the sake of 'the glorious principles of civil and religious liberty.' If he tolerated you, it would be *solely* out of regard to the *interests* of the Catholic church, which he would think to be *best served* by letting you alone."

All which we commend to the careful consideration of our readers.

I. E.

BUCKLE ON THE CIVILIZATION OF ENGLAND.

Mr. Buckle is clearly a man of talents, of great research, and of great powers of combination; but like all great men in the wrong, he makes the wrong the more clear by his self assurance and lordly bearing. All the unbelievers I have read are egotistic and haughty; so accustomed to frown upon superstition, they frown upon everything except their own *superstitious opposition to superstition!* Buckle is most unfair and unjust while he is eloquently pleading for fairness and justice. It is with him a great excellence in any man to doubt his own faith, or his own system of belief, but he never doubts his own doubts, nor doubts his ability to build a system of faith upon his own doubts! But whether you doubt confusedly or systematically, if you only doubt, you are a scholar and a man of genius;—if you believe, you are a plodder, a mere echo of other men's opinions!

Mr. Buckle's effort, I predict, will be a splendid failure. Not for want of ability, but for lack of truth. He is massing a great aggregation of materials, but he has no foundation for the superstructure. His theories and his principles are adopted, not because they are true, but because he has to use them in a certain case, and adapt them to a certain end. He is not honestly aiming to show the civilization of England for the honor of his country; *but for the purpose of ascribing all its benefits to Infidelity!* His principle, therefore, on which he rests his cause, is a false principle, and the work must fail. He

quarrels with every thing but skepticism, and is at war with all religion, Protestant and Catholic, and endeavors to honor science as the only thing worthy of admiration. He condemns all systems of metaphysics because they are based upon the study of the mind itself, the mind of each author, and contends that the mind must be studied in history; which is contrary to the doctrine of Bacon, and would throw the world back upon Aristotle! Science is the result of the study of Nature, and where can you study the mind but in its own workings or manifestations? The results of mind in history may confirm a doctrine learned from the mind itself. The whole history of the human race shows that man has always been religious!—This he would not admire as a result!

I am sorry to see the contracted partizan in Mr. Buckle, when he lauds so much, freedom from prejudice, and manliness of thought!—In writing a history of civilization in England, he ignores the labors of two of her noblest sons and her most honored names, Milton and Locke. They were true and staunch believers, and not a crumb of comfort is there for a man who worships unbelief. It is true he often mentions Locke, and sometimes with honor, but as a means of building up the fabric of civilization, when he comes to the times of Locke, he has nothing to say in his favor. Milton, too, he mentions, but barely and casually mentions, when in fact his single mind and hand did more to break the shackles of tyranny in church and State, than any one so highly applauded by Buckle.

The true principle of civilization is, that no nation or people ever worked out from itself its own civilization. It always comes from without, and is superinduced by science and religion. The Bible he utterly ignores, and can scarce decently express his infelt indignation against the book, and the contempt he feels for it. With a curled up lip he speaks of a scouted Moses, while, evidently, the wish is father to the thought. This shows the manners of the gentleman! His book will spread doubts about his own civilization! His work will never uproot the faith of England's people. They smile in pity at the scoffs of skeptics, and can afford to be liberal to those who attack their religion, because they feel secure in the foundations of their faith.

Mr. Buckle's authorities are all, with few exceptions, Christian authorities, and the actors on the stage of life stand out with the Bible in their hands. He praises Chillingworth, when he knew that Chillingworth was the bulwark and defense of Protestantism, uttering as the oracle on the standards, the noble sentiment, "*The Bible and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants.*" My own belief is, that Providence is allowing infidelity to bluster, merely to drive the

lovers of the Bible together, and make them give up all else, all sectarian standards and causes of strife, and unite on the Bible and on that alone. When that is done, unbelief has no pretense nor ground to stand upon. That time is not far in the future!

I shall now convict Mr. Buckle of a flagrant piece of bad manners, a breach of courtesy which he owes to society. If faith is asked to be liberal and charitable towards skepticism, it surely is not too much to ask of skepticism, as it is only a doubt, a mere doubt, a doubt of one in a thousand, to be at least respectful in its doubts. Faith is positive, is a real something, substantial in its proportions; but skepticism is ephemeral, not substantial, merely questions the reality or foundations of faith; is not built upon evidence, is not self evident, is a mere negative, and therefore is most unreasonable, weak and wicked, when it assumes to denounce and condemn others! Here is the case: "But because our researches into the phenomena of rain happen to have been less successful, we resort to the IMPIOUS *contrivance* of calling in the aid of the Deity to supply those deficiencies in science which are the result of our own sloth; and we are not ashamed, in our public churches, to prostitute the rites of religion by using them as a cloak to conceal an ignorance we ought frankly to confess." (p. 272–3.) It is hard to say whether this is more silly or wicked. It is a ridiculous ebullition of bad feeling, and reads more like a drunken revery than a sober objection against praying for rain! In this we have the naked baldness of unbelief. The whole case is jumbled together in great confusion. How would it help us, during a drouth, to know the laws of rain? Would that give us rain? Or if we knew the science of rain, I suppose Buckle thinks we could make rain for ourselves! Was ever anything more ridiculous? But he has overshot himself by the high scorn he feels for all religion? How can it be *impious* to pray for rain, when according to Mr. Buckle, there is no *piety* in the world! Rhe Bible asks, "Who can number the clouds in wisdom? or who can stay (or incline) the bottles of heaven?" (Job 38. 37.) We pray for daily bread, although we know the science by which we get bread. It is legitimate to pray for what we need according to the Scriptures, "when we ask according to his (God's) will." Moreover, no one's rights are interfered with in prayer for rain, and why then this wrath, from one who only doubts the necessity of it? You would think Buckle was a *Puritan*, to hear him whine over "the prostitution of the rites of religion." Oh dreadful! oh wonderful zeal for the churches and the proper use of prayer! But further, he is willing to confess his ignorance, and is only opposed to any one, by praying for rain, wearing a cloak for his ignorance instead of frankly confessing it. Alas for us, when

skeptics confess their ignorance! Be on your guard, there is evidently mischief in the wind!

Mr. Buckle is not only inconsistent in denouncing the faith and practice of others, unless he is in possession of a better way, better authenticated, and therefore more reasonable; but especially when he only doubts, or fails to believe, the ground on which others act. If he has honestly examined the ground of our belief and fails to be convinced, let him act accordingly, stand aloof where we move forward, and not take the seat of the censer and hurl condemnation upon our heads! Our faith is positive, a real existence, and as a result, we press it upon others; that is, we make an appeal to their reason, and lay the arguments before them which we deem conclusive, but if we fail to reach conviction, we leave them in possession of all their rights, without a desire to curtail them.

Besides, he is so anxious to spread his skepticism, that he jumps at conclusions which his premises will not justify. He applauds every enemy of Christianity, and eulogizes Mahomet, but never praises our Lord and Savior. He extols the Koran, but it is merely to lower the Bible. He calls Theodore Parker a "high authority," and makes great use of Newman's "*Phases of Faith*," but says not a word about "*The Eclipse of Faith*," in which Mr. Newman's conceits are all exposed with so much of wit and point, that Mr. Newman literally boils over in wrath in his review of that work. But if any unbeliever will read the "*Eclipse of Faith*," and then read, "A Defense of the Eclipse of Faith," in which is printed Mr. Newman's reply, he will see how much of reason unbelievers have for their course in opposition to the Bible. To all this Mr. Buckle makes not the slightest reference. Mr. Henry Rogers, one of the most brilliant minds now in England, is the author of that work and of its defense.

All unbelievers fall into the same plan of highly eulogizing their own writers, and all who agree with them; and of throwing suspicion upon either the honesty or the ability of every defender of the faith. "The Types of Mankind," by Nott and Gliddon, abounds with such proceedings. They laud to the skies every man who only thinks that the human race springs from many distinct and independent sources; while every man of the opposite opinion, even the greatest, is more than suspected on the score of honesty and sincerity. They try to make out that Dr. Prichard, who in all his works labors and reasons only to that one great point, of the unity of the origin of all the diversified races; that notwithstanding all this, they profess to see an undercurrent underlying all that he has written, in favor of the opposite doctrine! By such a rule of judging as this, a man can establish any thing he wishes, and by any authority he pleases. And

taking this example, one might say that all the savage things Mr. Gliddon has penned against the Bible, and especially against King James's Translation, and all his vituperations against the English evangelical clergy, who were so much beneath his criticism, and his most learned (?) efforts about the Hebrew square letter! and his etymological interpretations of the Hebrew of the tenth chapter of Genesis, in which he makes out, that the main words have a Germanic origin! —how do we know, after all, but that he had a great reverence for the Bible!

Mr. Buckle, however, is satisfied that geology has utterly ruined the cosmogony of Moses, and makes out that all the clergy of any note have given up Moses to his fate. My own judgment is that Moses will outlive Mr. Buckle, and all who sympathize with him in his attacks on true religion. He has great admiration for Compte's Positive Philosophy, just because its author is a sceptic. One thing is true about the science of Compte's work, and that is that no sceptic who ever lived has been the inventer of any great machine, nor the first to develope any great law of Nature, by which society has been blest, all their boasts to the contrary notwithwstanding; by ignoring the governing Mind of Nature, and his Providence over all things here, he has certainly put the extinguisher upon them, and made them follow in the train of *great Christian inventors and originators*, and cry, like Haman of old, "These are the men whom the King is delightedto honor"!!

Every new science, and every thing that wears its name, is seized upon by sceptics as the certain extinguisher of revealed religion.—Astronomy was to crush it certain; but still it held on its way;—and Geology in all its branches would be sure to wind up Moses, but still Moses lives and geology is passing through many phases, while Moses has only one face, and that resplendent with age. Phrenology, or the mapping of the head with bumps, was to do away and make short work with all religion; but the religion of the Bible keeps on its way, and even now George Combe is hardly ever read! Geology had two schools, one of which contended for an origin of the world by fire and one by water. Then they were divided again, between those who believed in a world that grew gradually and slowly up, and the catastrophists, who saw proofs of miraculous developments in the earth's structure. These now are fused into one by an amalgamation theory, and therefore we suggest that those who live in glass houses had better not throw stones! There is no occasion to discredit Moses by admitting all that geology brings up. Let them bore away, dig away, and bring up their old bones and old cynders, what does Moses care? There is no old cynder nor old bone so clear as the page

of Moses! What awful blunders have some men made in interpreting the layers of lava which covered Herculaneum. Men do not know as much as they think they do about the age of the world to be read out of old bones and old cynders.

Besides, the last best light of the science of geology, Mr. Miller, has compared the two theologies, and has not found them so incompatible as some might suppose. It is true, I have no faith in the theology of old cynders and old bones, but I have unshaken faith in the theology taught by Moses. It might be that God made this earth out of an old worn out planet, and remodeled it and gave it form, which will account for the deposites that we find. Or it may be that the days or periods of half the week of Moses, might be ten thousand years each, and untill the fourth day, when the light spread out before, from its creation on the first day, was concentrated in the sun, and brought the earth around on its axis in twenty four hours. Or, if it is incompatible upon this or any other hypothesis, I hold on to Moses, whom I know and admire, and wait for further light, which will be certain to clear up all difficulties. All subjects have their difficulties and mysteries, and if a man is determined not to eat until he knows how bread can turn into teeth, nails, hair, bones, blood and sinews, he must starve to death!

The minds of the people of England are undergoing a complete revolution, but it will all result in favor of the Bible and its friends. Atheists and Deists are lecturing, debating, and writing withot restraint; but they are met always by able and scientific men who tear off the mask and pretensions to learning, which it is so common for them to put on. "*Modern Atheism*," by Dr. Buchanan, is a searching pioduction, in which the "Vestiges of Creation," M. Comptes "Positive Philosophy,"—Mr. Newman's "Phases of faith," and George Combe's "Constitution of Man" are severally hashed up and peppered and spiced in the highest possible style of modern cookery! And I venture to affirm that it will be hard to admire any of these works or their authors after reading the lectures of Dr. Buchanan.

"*Christian Theism*," by Anchor Thompson, is another work, treating upon all these subjects in a masterly manner, and not once referred to by Mr. Buckle. These authors handle skeptics withont gloves, and are an overmatch for them both in science and in literature.—"*Christian Theism*," is a complete answer to almost all Mr. Buckle has in his bulky volume of special pleading in favor of scepticism. These authors are in real earnest, and they grapple with their opponents, and hold them in close quarters, and will not allow them to dodge the question nor evade its issue. The best of consequences

may be therefore expected as the result of their combined efforts.—Besides all this the best minds are being turned to the subject of Moses and the Messiah. The celebrated *Havernick* whose learning in orital literature is equal to that of any of his countrymen, has written "An introduction to the Old Testament," which I possess, and an "Introduction to the Pentateuch," which the war has so far prevented me from getting. In the last work he examines and refutes all the German objections, and all the learning of Gliddon on the tenth of Genesis. This I have seen in Dr. Smyth's "Unity of the human Races." So that the friends of the Bible may still hold up their heads and trust in the God of Moses. There is no fear of unbelief, for it is nothing, a mere negative, a No! J. H.

THE MISSOURI LOYALTY OATH.

We take pleasure in laying before our readers the following manly and Christian apology of our beloved Bro. Proctor, for declining to take the new-constitutional-oath of Missouri:

PARIS, Mo., Aug. 4, 1865.

DEAR BROTHER WRIGHT:—I have frequent inquiries from friends in different parts of Missouri as to the best course to take in reference to the new Constitution oath.

Such questions as the following have been asked by a number of the most prominent of my brethren in the State: "Shall we take this oath and preach?" "Shall we disregard it and preach?" "Shall we abandon the preaching of the Gospel in Missouri altogether?" As these are questions which I know are pressing heavily on the hearts of all thoughtful and conscientious men among us throughout the entire State, I have determined to submit my own convictions concerning them through your paper. My answer to the first of these questions, after the most deliberate and honest thought which I am capable of giving the subject, is this: While I hold it to be right and proper to take any oath which can be taken truthfully for the performance of any civil duty or the enjoyment of any civil right, I cannot take this or any other oath whatever, in order to enjoy the right to preach the Gospel. In an article, the length of which is limited by the size of your paper, I can give but few of the reasons for this decision.—To take this oath would violate all the deepest convictions of right and of duty, which a life of study—and which, I trust, has not been prayerless—has fixed in my mind and heart towards my God, my race, and my country.

1. My reading of the Bible and of history have led me to believe that my right to worship and to preach is a gift, not from Government, either directly or indirectly, but from God himself. Civil Governments confer rights upon men, because they are their citizens; but God grants rights to men, not because they citizens of any civil Government, but simply because they are men, the first of which, in the order of time and chief in importance, is religious freedom. My re-

ligious freedom, therefore, I receive from Him, and hence dare not surrender any part of it or abandon any of those high and sacred duties which such a gift imposes, and which are infinitely more precious to men than all the rights which civil Governments can bestow, or than life itself.

2. Towards my race. It is well known to all readers of history that God has given to men all the religious freedom which we now have in the world, not through the instrumentality of Governments, but in spite of them. Only a few centuries past, the civil Governments of Europe claimed the high prerogative of conferring religious rights, or of taking them away. But there were found men then whose allegiance to God was too high and true to yield to those claims: hence they were required to subscribe to "oaths of supremacy," "oaths of loyalty," and "test oaths" which filled the dungeons of Europe with the greatest and purest men then on the globe. Those men, through centuries of suffering, have transmitted to us, their posterity, from their prisons, their scaffolds and their tortures, the divine gift of our religious liberty. This we have received as a sacred legacy in trust, to be used by us for the benefit of mankind, and to be transmitted, for the same lofty purpose, to succeeding generations; hence to take this oath is to be faithless to the solemn trust of the great and good of all past ages and a betrayal of the highest and holiest interest of those which are to come. I cannot consent by any act of mine to turn back the tide of our civilization and religious progress a half dozen centuries.

3. Towards my country. To the most superficial in the knowledge of the past, it need not be told that the American Revolution, which gave us our Government, was but the outgrowth of those conflicts and struggles for religious freedom already alluded to. Those great and venerable men, who laid the foundation of that Government, which has been the fountain of untold blessings to the inhabitants of this continent, learned from the example of their noble ancestors in the world, to love and suffer for the principles which have made it what it is. When they gave us our Constitution, they said religious freedom is too great a gift to be conferred by man. God only can bestow that. Therefore we will protect all men in the enjoyment of it. In this spirit they formed the great charter on which our Government stands. To take this oath would make me false to the memory of those men and to the spirit and genius of the Government which they have given me.

4. We are conscious that it is denied that such requirements as these are really in the oath. To make this palpable I will quote Sec. 14, Art. 2, of the new constitution: "Whoever shall, after the times limited in the 7th and 9th sections of this article, hold or exercise any of the offices, positions, trusts, professions or functions therein specified, without having taken, subscribed and filed said oath of loyalty, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by fine, not less than five hundred dollars, or by imprisonment in the county jail not less than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment." Now the 9th section virtually declares vacant all offices held by bishops, priests, deacons, ministers, elders and other clergymen of any religious persuasion, at the end of sixty days, after the constitution takes effect. It does this by enacting that no such person shall be competent after

that time to exercise the functions of such offices without taking, subscribing and filing the oath of loyalty. Observe now the 14th section above quoted, declares that the penalties mentioned in it shall be inflicted upon whoever *holds* any of these offices after that time without the approval of the State. I call special attention to the word "*hold*"; no one shall be permitted to *hold* after the time specified without taking the oath, any of these offices, but bishops, priests, deacons, &c., do hold these offices *now*, but those who do not take this oath dare not hold them THEN.

By whose authority do these classes of men hold their offices now? and after the 3d of September, when they dare not hold them, by whose authority will they have been deprived of them? There is not one of them but that believes their right to hold them is not from men, but from God. Unless, then, they are sadly mistaken in that belief, the State claims the power to deprive them of offices, professions, trusts and functions which can only be conferred by God himself.

It goes farther than this. It says they shall not only not hold these offices, but the same penalties are threatened against the "exercise of any of the functions therein specified." Now, among our people, some of the "functions" of an office of an elder is to call the people together for public worship, to exhort them to pure and holy lives, to rebuke those who sin; but, after the 3rd of September, without the approval of the State, they cannot do this; and some of the functions of the office of a deacon are to distribute the charities of the church to the destitute, and the elements which represent the body and blood of Christ, to his disciples assembled. *These constitute the essential parts of our worship every first day of the week.* It will be readily seen that, to deprive these men of the exercise of the functions of their offices, is to disorganize all our churches and break up all our public worship. How then can any conscientious man recognize the right of the State to do this, by taking any oath whatever, without, at the same time, betraying the fundamental principles of all the civil and religious freedom now in the possession of men.

But again, suppose all the officers, preachers, elders and deacons, should take the oath, and to that degree make the Church subordinate to the State, what kind of a Church would that be? What would be the esteem of the world for such a Church? What estimate would be placed upon her even by those men who have placed her in that position? Unless we violate all the principles on which a judgment of that kind can be formed, *even they* must feel a profound contempt for the church *they* have made. What must she think of herself, when she has lost her God-given position in the world, and become an appendage to the State? When I preach the gospel, let me believe that I hold my commission from the Eternal King; and the Church which I serve, let me believe, acknowledges Him as her one only supreme head, and is free and unpolluted by any alliance with the world.

What then is to be done in the melancholy issue which is thus forced upon us? Must we adopt the unfeeling suggestion of a prominent member of the Convention which formed the new Constitution? When it was seen by some that the class of men proscribed by it must be driven from the State, he said: "Let them go. Men who

can take the oath will occupy their places." I have lived in Missouri nearly thirty years; many preachers, elders and deacons, longer than that. Besides, a general association with the people of the State nearly twenty years as a preacher of the gospel, has attached me to them with ties closer, stronger and deeper than could ever be formed again elsewhere. The homes of my kindred and friends are here, and the graves of my father and mother, and brothers and sisters; and I wish to live in the State which was theirs, and when I die, I wish to be buried by them; hence, to me, the unutterable heartlessness af those words, "Let them go." If there is a place in the world where I can be useful, it is the place which God, in his providence, has assigned me, and I do not feel at liberty to abandon it. To be forced away, not because of any disloyalty, (for no man who has known me before and during the war, and has any self-respect, will charge me with that,) but because I belong to a class, and because I cannot violate my sense of duty to God and my country, I feel to be a wrong the most painful that I can conceive. To obey cheerfully all laws and authorities, and to teach men so, has been a principle from which I never deviated; but to command men by law to stultify all moral sense and self respect, to say by the solemn form of an oath, that is true and right which in their hearts they believe to be false and wrong, is the saddest thing that has occurred in the civilized world in the last hundred years.

But it will be said, it has already been said, that such sentiments are disloyal. This I must solemnly deny. It is because I love my country and reverence her authority, and desire, above all earthly things, her perpetual peace and prosperity, that these things pain me. "For it was not an enemy that reproached me, then I could have borne it; neither was it he that hated me that did magnify himself against me, then I could have hid myself from him: but it was thou, my country, whom I have loved as my mother. It is thy command, that I have venerated next to my Bible, that requires me to do this thing, which seems to me to be a wrong, committed against the liberties of mankind. If my humble voice could reach the ear of those editors and politicians who threaten with the odium of disloyalty all who feel these convictions, I would entreat them to pause and think. "They know not what they do." What and whom do they threaten? A majority of the people of Missouri are grieved at heart at the false position in which they are placed. Our great State, for which we feel so much pride and affection, has been engineered by the accident of revolution, into a position of antagonism to the church, to the religious and moral sense of the people, and, we believe, to the vital principle on which the National Government rests. We appeal, in the name of God and of liberty, and of a large number of the people, to those who have it in their power to relieve us according to law, to hasten to do it, and save us from anarchy, suffering and wrong. To my brethren, to all Christians, I counsel faithful obedience to the laws, both for conscience' sake and the word of God. "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's." As an humble fellow-citizen, I would respectfully entreat those in authority to divest themselves of all violence of speech and of action, when dealing with the religious convictions of a great people. One honest, true-hearted man in prison, on account of reli-

gious and moral convictions, would be a more terrible enemy to vanquish than all the armies in the south. A. PROCTOR.

REMARKS.

We are pleased to see that the Christian sentiment of Missouri is too loyal to all that is divine in human rights, to stoop to the behests of a opposing and infidel power, temporarily exalted to political supremacy in that State, and, true to its old instincts, greedy to strike its poisonous fangs into the vitals of religious liberty. All praise to the noble and true men who prefer fine and imprisonment rather than a base recreancy to the sacred trust of ministerial duty! The church is an institution of God. It is above all human governments. It derives none of its essential features from human authority.—Civil government can neither make nor unmake an officer in her organization. She cannot prescribe the terms of admission into this kingdom, nor dictate the conditions of expulsion from its fellowship. It is founded by Christ and upon Christ, and ruled over and legislated for only by Christ. His authority is supreme in all things. If we are to obey the "powers that be," it is only in subordination to the higher duty of obeying Him. Wherever there is collision between any two authorities, the lower must give place to the higher. Hence it is eternally true, that "*It is better to obey God than man.*"

The true question for a Christian man to raise in a case of this kind is, "Whether there be a real collision between the divine and the human authority." This is a question which should be calmly considered and conscientiously answered. We carry our subordination to civil government to the utmost verge of our duty to the law of Christ. During our recent troublous times, we exchanged sentiments with many good and God-fearing men, and we claim to fall behind none in our conception of a Christian's duty, in times of revolution or civil chaos, to the "powers that be." We hold that he has no right to consult his personal preferences or to follow the drawings of his excited passions. His political theories he may advocate and vote for, so far as the law allows; but when the question is one of legal requirement on the part of the "power," and of obedience on the part of the citizen, the Christian can have no option. He must, in all cases where the law is not in collision with the will of God, obey the law, and sacrifice his private opinions and preferences. In this respect the Christian has not the privilege of the mere citizen.—He cannot become an instigator of resistance to civil authority. He must *submit*, without resistance, even where he cannot obey. That favorite motto, "Resistance to tyrants is duty to God," is only true for the men of this world. For men of the kingdom of Christ, it is

one of the most carnal of heresies. Their weapons are not carnal, but spiritual and mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds, but not by the hand of violence. The kingdoms of this world are founded in violence, they are maintained by the sword, and, when the God-given rights of humanity are trampled under foot of tyrants, they are reformed or overthrown by the sword. This is the lesson of universal history, and the principle adopted by God himself in the temporal government of the children of Israel. Hence we believe in war and revolution, as a part of the economy of this world, as much we do in the storm and the tempest, or the famine and the plague.—They are the great moral compensations of a system containing essential evil; the divine vindication of God's earthly policy towards a people prone to transgression and sin; the temporal judgments of the Great Judge for the conservation of the world, that the church may have time and opportunity for spreading the gospel and preparing for the glorious reign of the Prince Messiah. But just because they are peculiarly parts of the economy of *this world*, and necessitated by its evil, do we contend that they are no legitimate work for him who is "not of this world." This is peculiarly the line of demarkation between the church and the world. The economy of the one looks simply to the fortunes, good or bad, of men in this life; the economy of the other makes the fortunes of this life subordinate to those of the life to come. Hence any indulgence of the selfish passions for mere earthly good, that violates the law of Christian charity or hinders the power of the gospel, either on the tongue or in the heart of its professors, must be wrong. Hence our Savior raised no resistance to the authority of the Cæsars. Though the Empire was black with the crimes of centuries, and civil and political corruption polluted every part of the government, from the Emperor to the meanest Satrap, yet neither he nor his apostles uttered a word of rebellion, nor did any thing to countenance in the oppressed multitudes the sentiment of revolt. Uniformly he disclaimed all intention to interfere by violence with the political powers then in the ascendent; and his disciples, long after, in imitation of his example, went to the fagot and the stake in *suffering*, but raised no arm and uttered no word in *resistance* or *revolt*. They disobeyed the law whenever the law was against the authority of God, and then quietly and meekly suffered the penalty. But whenever they could, consistently with their duty to Christ, they uniformly obeyed the civil authority which was in the supremacy at the time. As to the *right* of the government, they raised no question. In the high sense of our modern and I may say Christian notions of freedom, there was at that time no government that was not an usurpation and a tyranny. Yet their precept and their practice were—

uniform obedience, save where the higher law of Christ forbade them.

The rule of the Christian's life is always the same. He must remember that in espousing Christ, he renounces the world, and cannot indulge himself contrary to the law of his own allegiance in schemes of revolt or revolution, however much the worldly interests of mankind may seem to justify them, simply because to him it is said, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king, as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well." (1 Pet. 2: 12–14.) "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordered of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." (Rom. 13: 1–2.)

If "the powers that be are ordered of God," then the revolutions that raise up or pull down these powers are also ordered of God.—They are a part of the policy of this world, and belong to the men of this world. But the church is apart from the world. It consists of an elect race, called out from the world, to be a peculiar people. They are commanded to submit to the worldly powers, whatever they may be, not because these powers may not sometimes deserve to be shaken and overthrown, but because the Lord will not have his people undertake or engage in the work. It is a work for which he will raise up fitting hands, but one which he denies his people the privilege of doing. Hence the question *de jure* of a government is one which, practically, a Christian has nothing to do with. The government *de facto* is that which he is called upon to obey. In times of revolution and political chaos, it may be often difficult for a Christian to decide which of two contending powers is the one that is entitled to his obedience; but even in these times of transition and incertitude, a wise and prudent abstinence from obtrusive participation in the contest on either side, will relieve him of much of the embarrassment that otherwise he would suffer.

We return then to our proposition, that the true question for a Christian man to raise concerning any ordinance of government, is not whether the ordinance be right, according to the constitution or any assumed abstract principles of human rights, but whether it comes into positive and practical collision with the duty which he owes to God. If it does, he is bound to disobey it; otherwise, however objectional or tyrannical it may be, he ought to obey it. We turn then to this required "Oath of Loyalty," and inquire, in the light of these leading principles, Ought a Christian man to obey it?

The oath itself requires the party to swear, with the minutest detail of specifications, that he has never by act or word manifested his adherence to the cause of the enemies of the United States, or of the State of Missouri, or his sympathy with the same, &c., &c., in much of which there is much to object to, both on the score of policy and the abstract and conceded rights of a free people; but it is not in our province to treat of these questions;—they will doubtless soon be decided by the courts. But the 9th section makes the taking of this oath necessary in order to hold the offices of the Christian church.—It prescribes that no person "shall be competent as a bishop, priest, deacon, minister, elder, or other clergyman of any religious persuasion, sect or denomination, to teach, or preach, or solemnize marriages, unless such person shall have first taken, subscribed and filed said oath." To that part of this requisition which relates to the "offices, positions, trusts, professions and functions" of the State, we have nothing to say. The State creates them and gives them, and the State may take them away. But the offices of the Christian church are not the appointment of man. Human government does not create them nor give them, and it has no right to take them away. They are set in the church by God. Their title is given and their duties are prescribed by the Great Head of the church. He commands us to *teach* and to *preach*, because we are Christians and *his ministers*.—But this oath prescribes a political test as a qualification for a preacher of the gospel. We dispute not the authority of the State to prescribe this test for political officers. It may be ri ht or wrong; in harmony with our free institutions, or the very quintessence of tyranny —yet, as a Christian, I say to all men who want office, submit to it. But when the government goes beyond the sphere of the government, and raises its authority in a kingdom not its own, and undertakes to limit and restrict the powers and privileges of the officers of that kingdom, contrary to the commands of its Sovereign, then we object, and with all the earnestness of a true and loyal subject of the Prince Messiah, enter in his name our solemn *protest*.

I know it is thought by some good and conservative men that it is better to take the oath where it can be done,—and where it cannot, to avoid its consequences by abandoning the State. But this were to admit a principle, which might hinder many eminent servants of God from the faithful discharge of their highest and most solemn duties to the church. If the State has a right to prevent one from preaching the Gospel because he sympathized with the Rebellion, then it can also say say that no one shall preach the gospel because he has sympathized with the union: and by such a Janus-faced prescription, stop the preaching of the gospel altogether. If the State of Missou-

ri can rightly exercise this restriction upon the preaching of the Gospel, then every other State can do the same and thus all men, who could not truthfully take this oath would be debarred from preaching the gospel or exercising any of the functions of a Christian office.—The free commission of the Savior "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature" would thus be trammeled by the interference of human authority, and the church, in her mission and field of operation, restricted to the limits prescribed by the license of her enemies. Who does not see in this result, a direct antagonism between this oath and the commandment of Christ? The oath says to certain persons, "Speak no more in this name," and the commandment says, "Go into all the world and preach it to every creature."

But it may be argued that because of a political offence, these proscribed ministers have forfeited their right to officiate in the church. We answer, this cannot be. Political offences may be punished by the State. Any violation of political laws the State may punish by political penalties, but not by an invasion of the province and prerogative of the church. Suppose for the sake of illustration, that some citizen of Missouri not a member of the church at all, had both by word and deed participated in the rebellion;—suppose this to have been not only a crime against government, but also against heaven, but that after the war was over, and peace had been restored, this person is led to see the error of his way, and truly and acceptably repenting of his sins, is duly admitted into the kingdom of Christ. Suppose now that this person is called by his congregation to the work of a teacher. Would his past offences incapacitate him for the discharge of this duty? Surely not. Yet they would prevent him from taking this oath—and without the oath, the State would not allow him to preach. Here then, we find a political rule acting as a bar to the exercise of a religious duty, where the law of Christ clearly commands its performance. This is collision—and whom shall the Christian obey? It is said that if any one disregards this law and suffers the penalty, his punishment will be for the political offence, of having sympathized with the rebellion. But let us consider this rather hasty judgment. The penalty is imposed, according to the constitution, for *holding* and *exercising* the office without the oath. If the party only abstains from teaching and preaching there will be no penalty—no matter what the participation may have been in the rebellion. Indeed a person may have no participation in the rebellion, yet if he preach or teach without taking the oath, he will be punished. Is the penalty then imposed for the political crime of having sympathized with the rebellion—or because the victim has presumed to discharge

his duty as a minister of the Christian church, without a license so to do from the State? The answer is evident. And we are gratified to see that the true nature of this issue has been clearly perceived by the Christian ministry in Missouri and that they have determined with almost unbroken front to meet it as becomes true men of God. The question is not one of policy but of principle; and so vital is the principle, that the very foundations of religious obligation and freedom must be shaken by its surrender. We cannot believe that the public sentiment of Missouri will sustain the law, or that the judicial tribunals will be slow to pronounce it contrary to the will of human rights—and thus we trust that the faithful men who have determined to stand at their posts and do their duty in the fear of God and the love of man, will come to no evil by their conduct, but come what may, God will surely sustain them in their noble fidelity to his cause and give them if need be a martyr's crown for their loyal adherence to the authority of his kingdom. W. K. P.

RAPID INCREASE OF THE ROMISH CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

In a recent address, before a Protestant audience gathered from all parts of London, Mr. Spurgeon spoke as follows:

"It is a most fearful fact, that in no age since the Reformation, has Popery made such fearful strides in England as during the last few years. I had comfortably believed that Popery was only feeding itself upon foreign subscriptions, upon a few titled perverts, and imported Monks and Nuns. I dreamed that its progress was not real. In fact, I often smiled at the alarm of many of my brethren at the progress of Papacy. But, my dear friends, we have been mistaken, grievously mistaken. If you will read a valuable paper in the magazine called Christian Work, those of you who are not acquainted with it will be perfectly startled with its revelations. This great city is now covered with a net-work of Monks, and Priests, and Sisters of Mercy, and the conversions made are not by ones or twos, but by scores, till England is being regarded as the most hopeful spot for Romish missionary enterprise in the world; and at the present moment there is not a mission which is succeeding to any thing like the extent which the English mission is. I covet not their money; I despise their sophistries; but I marvel at the way in which they gain their funds for the erection of their ecclesiastical buildings. It is really an alarming matter to see so many of our countrymen going off to that superstition which, as a nation, we once rejected, and which it was supposed we would never again receive. Popery is making ad-

vances such as you would never believe, though a spectator should tell it to you. Close to your very doors, perhaps even in your own houses, you may have evidence, ere long, of what a march Romanism is making. And to what is it to be ascribed? I say with every ground of probability, that there is no marvel that Popery should increase, when we have two things to make it grow:—first of all, the falsehood of those who profess a faith which they do not believe, which is quite contrary to the honesty of the Romanist, who does, through good report and evil report, hold his faith; and then you have, secondly, this form of error known as Baptismal Regeneration, and called Puseyism, which is not only Puseyism, but Church-of-Englandism, because it is in the Prayer Book as plain as words can express it; you have this Baptismal Regeneration preparing stepping-stones to make it easy for men to go to Rome. * * * We want John Knox back again. Do not talk to me of mild and gentle men, of soft manners and squeamish words. We want the fiery Knox, and even though his vehemence would 'dung our pulpits into blads,' it were well if he did but rouse our hearts to action. We want Luther, to tell men the truth unmistakably in homely phrase. The velvet has got into our ministers' mouths of late, but we must unrobe ourselves of soft raiment, and truth must be spoken; for of all lies which have dragged millions down to hell, I look upon this as being one of the most atrocious—that in a Protestant church there should be found those who swear that Baptism saves the soul."

THE HOPE OF MAN.—Final success—the joy of life's ripe harvest—is the goal of our hopes. No wise or thoughtful man will live merely for to-day. The pilgrim who seeks a home is not content to linger and loiter for the mere flowers beside his way. The sower looks on the fields white and ready for the sickle. Wisdom has regard for the grand issue. The triumph or pleasure of to-day is transitory. We want a hope that does not sink with the setting sun.—The true success of life is that which does not fail on the evening of our days, and leave them to blight and barrenness. We want that shout "of harvest home," that will not die with the failing breath, but makes the passage of the grave a whispering gallery where heaven and earth talk together.—*E. H. Gillet.*

Evils in the journey of life, are like the hills which alarm travelers upon their road; they both appear great at a distance, but when we approach them, we find that they are far less insurmountable than we had conceived.

INSTRUCTION FOR MINISTERS.

It has been a subject of long and mature reflection on our part, to meet the demand, everywhere increasing, among the brotherhood, for a practical and efficient course of ministerial instruction. We are happy to announce the success of our efforts, and cordially invite all who desire the benefit of our labors, to come on at once, and attend the course now inaugurated in Bethany College for this purpose. Thorough instruction will be given in Mental Science; Belles Lettres; Logic; Evidences of Christianity; Butler's Analogy; Church Government; Sacred Rhetoric; Composition and delivery of Sermons; Exercises in Extemporaneous Speaking; Pastoral Training, and Christian Ethics. These studies, any young man of good natural parts and ordinary English education, can prosecute with interest and profit, and most of them may be embraced in the course of a single session.

For young men who can devote more time and study, and who, besides, have made sufficient proficiency in Classical studies, the course is still further enlarged so as to embrace the study of the Scriptures in Hebrew and Greek, with Exegetical and Critical Treatment; and Lectures on the History of the Books of the Bible. Classes will be instructed in these studies this session; and so soon as they are prepared to advance to them, they will be passed on to the study of Biblical Antiquities and History; Criticism and Interpretation; Church History; History of Doctrines and History of Polemics.

We hope to make this course of instruction eminently practical, so as to develop, not stiff and pedantic young theologians, but earnest, efficient and zealous preachers of the gospel, and wise and eminently spiritual ministers of the word in its wide and varied application to the heads and hearts of saints and sinners. It will afford us great pleasure to have a large class to fit for these high purposes and labors of life. We know how much the churches are calling for men so-prepared for service and therefore we urge them to send us the material, that we may return them, in due season, what they need. Never were the Lord's people more loudly called to a generous effort for giving the Gospel to the millions. The preacher, the earnest, eloquent and godly preacher is God's appointed instrument for the work. We must prepare him, send him, and keep him going, or the power of the gospel will slumber in our hands. Send us the young men, then brethren; men of good heads and right hearts, and we will fit them, as soon as may be for your service. Send them at once, for our plans are matured and the classes are now under way. Help us to make this labor of love a work of great profit to the Lord's kingdom.

W. K. PENDLETON.
C. L. LOOS.

HARBINGER FOR 1866.

We are beginning to cast about us to see what shall be done for and through the Harbinger for 1866. We have been greatly gratified by the good opinions of many friends—and no little encouraged by what increase of substantial evidence of a continued support, we have received. We know that the Harbinger does not get the support that many good brethren think it deserves, nor which, by a more strenuous exertion of the ordinary commercial arts which are employed in such cases, we might procure. But we have very little taste for these arts, and even less time, perhaps, than inclination to resort to them.

For 1866, we hope to offer increased inducements to our readers, not only to continue their own subscription, but to help us to enlarge our list to at least double its present number. This, dear brethren, you can readily do. We trust our acquaintance has been sufficiently agreeable to gratify me in asking you to introduce us favorably to your friends and neighbors. Will you not exert yourselves to send us on some new names for 1866? *We intend to purchase an entire new font of type.* This will be accompanied by an expense that will probably consume the entire profits of the year; but the respect which we owe to the enterprise, forbids our longer postponing this improvement.

It will greatly aid us to bear this expenditure, if brethren will exert themselves but a little to extend our circulation. What say you, reader? Will you help us to wear our new name? How small a contribution this will be to the aid of a good work! How many will make it? Send in early, not only your own names, but as many new ones as you can procure; and let us feel that whilst we are working to produce, there are many good and true who are ready and willing to help us to circulate, whatever may tend to the glory of God or the good of humanity.

W. K. P.

CORRESPONDENCE FROM AUSTRALIA.

We are gratified to lay before our readers the subjoined correspondence. It is cheering to hear of the success of the glorious gospel in these far-off regions;—and especially do we rejoice that our brother and former student, Bro. Earl, has become, in the hands of the Lord, his eminent instrument in so great a work as he has accomplished. The call is loud from these regions for help, and is sustained by a liberality of pecuniary support that is worthy of all praise. We trust that those to whom the confidence of supplying this demand has been entrusted, will act promptly, wisely and well; for a mistake in the beginning of such a work, may inflict an injury upon the cause that half a century cannot repair.

Besides the subjoined correspondence, we have received files of the "South Australia Register," sent us by our beloved Bro. H. Hussey, in which we find an interesting correspondence between himself and a Mr. E. G. Day, of the "New Church." We have been gratified and edified in reading Bro. Hussey's very able refutation of some of the absurdities of Swedenborgianism, as vindicated by Mr. Day. May the Lord's richest blessings be with his people scattered abroad in Australia, and greatly multiply their number and zeal for the honor and glory of his name. W. K. P.

---

236 Elizab'h St., Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.
25th July, 1865.

Dear Brother Campbell:—We have very heartily to thank the Lord for the soul stirring and gladdening season which we have for twelve months been enjoying. It is the Lord's doing and marvellous in our eyes, tho' I am inclined to think we betray our own shortcomings when we express surprise at the success of the glorious Gospel of the favor of God, when clearly, scripturally and with earnestness and affection set before the people. Knowing from whom that "Glad tidings" comes; having his design in sending it forth to every creature clearly revealed, we ought not only to labor and pray for, but confidently expect its accomplishment of the thing whereunto, in love, He hath sent it. But I need not say anything on this point to you, dear brother. If I had but a hundredth part of your experience I suppose I should have still more faith in the ultimate success of the Truth than I have. Being persuaded that you love to rejoice with them that do rejoice at the success of the gospel, I determined to write you by the out-going mail.

No doubt you have heard that the chief human agent in this work here, is our beloved and esteemed Bro. Henry S. Earl, A.B., formerly of Bethany College, W. Va. He has been here the past 12 months laboring assiduously the whole time. On Sundays in our busy and flourishing metropolis, Melbourne, he speaks in words of encouragement, admonition and exhortation to those whom he has immersed during the week, upon their reception into the church on the Lord's day mornings. He preaches in our largest public building in town—St. George's Hall—in the evenings. The Hall is on every occasion crowded; and it holds from twelve hundred to fifteen hundred persons. During the week Bro. Earl spends his time in visiting the numerous enquirers who remain for conversation after his discourses, or otherwise intimate their wish to see him. He preaches a short practical discourse each Friday evening in a small meeting house in another part of Melbourne, after which he immerses those who have decided to obey the Savior. He also preaches as he has time and opportunity offers in the suburbs, at the following places, where there are churches "contending for the faith," as "once delivered to the saints," viz: Prahrau, Brighton, Beau Maris, Chesterville, Bulleen. We have some half dozen churches scattered through the interior of the colony, to two of which, Maryborough and Ballaratt, Bro. Earl has paid short visits, with gratifying results. The latter of the two has the largest church, and a new building has just been opened and a cheering prospect lies before them. At Bulleen—a country farming district—the Truth has made rapid strides, and our brethren may be said to be there masters of the field.

In Melbourne the brethren have a new building for the use of the church in course of completion. It is neat and substantial and calculated to hold about 800 persons. Bro. Earl, in the year he has been with us, has been the means, under God, of adding to the churches not less than 300 souls. Of these many are highly intelligent, pious persons. Others many, have been like brands plucked from the burning. The young, middle-aged and old are all represented, as are the poor and the well-to-do in this world's goods. Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, and even Roman Catholics and infidels, have come forward, to the glory of God and joy of their own and the brethren's hearts.

Our brother also conducts an "Adelphian Society," which he initiated here, soon after his arrival. At its meetings brethren—chiefly though not exclusively the younger ones—go through the following exercises: Giving out hymns; engaging in prayer; reading portions of the Scriptures; reciting portions of Scripture; reading essays on moral and religious subjects, and delivering discourses and addresses. Each exercise is publicly criticised, for the benefit of all present. We find a marked improvement in some of the members who thus have received instruction and encouragement, and expect to see them engaged in the Lord's service more or less in the future, as they have opportunity.

We have, therefore, you may easily imagine, dear Bro. Campbell, great cause for rejoicing and thankfulness. But I have peculiarly to rejoice and be grateful. I have for some years been laboring in the work of the Lord, exhorting in the churches, and preaching the gospel in the suburbs. I have met with many encouragements, though I have always come too far short of doing the Master's work in a way satisfactory to myself. Bro. Earl has greatly encouraged me, and after laboring with him in my leisure time, some of the brethren have very kindly agreed to support me for twelve months, while, under Bro. Earl and in conjunction with him, I train for an Evangelist. When I showed him your ever-to-be-prized letter, containing your noble offer, he said it was truly a pity that I was persuaded against accepting it. Still, as he says, all may be for the best. If I succeed in the work, it is within the range of possibility that I may visit America some day, now that the war is over. If the Lord should open up my way so to do, one of the dearest wishes of my heart may be accomplished—that of seeing and thanking Brother A. Campbell. My future, however, is in God's hands. I asked him to *lead* me, and I wish only to *follow*. I have written twice or thrice to you. I don't know whether the war in any way caused my letters to miscarry. In my last, I asked whether you could send some tracts and small publications for distribution and sale.—Bro. Earl tells me he has just received invoice of Hymn Books, Bro. Anderson's Translation, Bro. McGarvey's Commentary on the Acts, and a number of tracts, &c.; therefore I shall not need to remit £5 to you for that purpose, as I had thought of doing. Bro. Earl is also seeking subscribers for the American Christian Review. I hope we shall get a good number of publications circulated here.

The brethren work together pretty harmoniously. The chief troubles in the past have been about "family matters,"—I mean internal affairs about discipline and matters of expediency, not about violations of principle. There has lately been a good deal of talk among members as to what is a matter of opin-

ion and what a matter of principle. The occasion of this has been that some think there is no "law" and therefore can be no transgression, about taking a free-will offering towards the building of the new chapel from outsiders, i. e. those who are not baptized believers. Others think that the law is plain—only Christians should be permitted to enjoy the privilege and discharge the duty of giving of their substance towards the spread of the gospel. We trust the matter is subsiding, and that no unpleasantness will result. Indeed, the matter is settled by the former ones waiving what they think to be their "right" to accept free-will offerings from any. In view of my position, I take no part in the matter, as it might destroy my usefulness. It would be expedient, perhaps, for any Evangelist who may labor here, to do so on all such points.

By the way, I trust Bros. Franklin, McGarvey, Lard and yourself, have already induced some warm-hearted Evangelist to come and labor amongst us. There is much room here, and a good interest has been awakened. This is the case also with the neighboring colonies of South Australia, New South Wales, and New Zealand, who are all crying out for a share of Bro. Earl's labors.

Failing to think of anything else of interest to you, I remain, dear Brother Campbell, yours in the love of Jesus. JAMES W. WEBB.

MELBOURNE, VICTORIA, July 25th, 1865.

DEAR BROTHER CAMPBELL:—Since writing in May, a new Evangelist Committee have been elected, who are to meet on the first Monday evening in Aug. You will therefore hear from us next mail. The good work still continues, and we believe "the Lord has much people in this city."

This week concludes the first year of our beloved Bro. Earl's labors among us. Including those received from the Baptists, Two Hundred and ninety-six persons have been added to the churches in and around Melbourne. Pray with us, that the work may go on increasingly.———Yours, in hope of life everlasting. CHARLES GRAHAM LAWSON, Sec. Ev. Com.

INDIANA NEWS.

BRO. PENDLETON:—The army of the Lord is rapidly increasing, and the foe are rapidly being vanquished.

Bro Roe reports the labors of himself and brethren Wheeler, Reese, Lord, Barnum, and Clendenen in the Ind. and Mich. Co-operation of 121 days resulting in 96 added; Bro. W. S. Patterson the evangelist of District No. 2, 141 days labor and 255 added; Bro. Spencer 8 added; Bros. Speer and Treat, 70 added; J. H. Henry 10 added; Bro. T. Lockhart several added; E. Adamson 8 added; Bro. A. D. Dailey and self 14 added; Good meeting at New Washington 13 added. In great hope,

R. L. HOWE, Cor. Sec'y. I. C. M. S.

BALTIMORE, Md., Sept., 1865.

I had 25 additions in Harford co. last week, and eight or ten the week before in Lock haven, Pa. D. S. BURNET.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 36.] BETHANY, W. V., *NOVEMBER*, 1865. [No. XI.

ADDITIONAL TESTIMONIES FOR IMMERSION.

It has ever been a convincing argument, in the controversy about sprinkling and pouring, that the most eminent Pedobaptist critics, translators, commentators, lexicographers, and ecclesiastical historians, have given their testimony for immersion, alike as to the meaning of the original term, and the practice of the primitive church.—The peculiar value of the testimony is found in the fact that it is in opposition to all their educational and theological prejudices, and is given in a case where it is evident that nothing but the irresistible power of truth could have called it forth. We may add that there is, if possible, an increased weight belonging to the more recent testimonies of this description. The earlier witnesses, testifying before the controversy had became so important, may be supposed to have spoken without a knowledge of all the facts which that controversy has elicited. But this cannot be said of the later witnesses. They are in possession of all the facts. They know, too, the use that controversialists will make of their admissions, and how adverse to the interests of their own party, these admissions must prove. And if, under these circumstances, they are nevertheless compelled, as honest men, to testify, in courts of learning, against their own party, and their own practice, too, it is most evident that the omnipotence of truth has compelled it.

We wish, therefore, to place on record, two or three candid and weighty testimonies, from Pedobaptist sources, which we think have never yet appeared on the pages of the Harbinger. They are supported by names of very high authority in the learned world.

CONYBEARE, in that magnificent work, "*The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*," has borne emphatic testimony—in the Life, to the primitive practice; in his translation, to the import of the term:

"It is needless to add that baptism was (unless in exceptional cases) administered by immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water, to represent his death to the life of sin, and then raised from this momentary burial to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness. It must be a subject of regret that the general discontinuance of this original form of baptism (though perhaps necessary in our northern climates) has rendered obscure to popular apprehension some very important passages of Scripture."—VOL. i. p. 439.

The words of caution thrown in parenthetically, render this testimony the more valuable, as they serve to show that the inclinations of the witness are all to the other side of the controversy. Nevertheless, he regards the historical facts in favor of the practice so abundant and indisputable, as to be beyond controversy: hence he says, "*It is needless to add*," etc.

"With him therefore we were buried by the baptism wherein he shared his death, [when we sank beneath the waters, and were raised from under them], that even as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we likewise might walk in newness of life."—Tr. of Rom. vi. 4, vol. ii. p. 169.

In a note, the translator says: "This passage cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion."

BENGEL, in his Gnomon, is evidently disposed to avoid this controversy as much as possible. So we judge, at least, first, from his silence in his notes on several passages where there are the best reasons for speaking out; secondly from his non-committalism, when he is compelled to speak—as in his note on Romans vi. 4, "*We were buried with him*": "The fruits of the burial of Christ. Immersion in baptism, *or at least the sprinkling of water upon the person*, represents burial; burial is a confirmation of [facit ratam] death."

Clearly, this cautious critic is not disposed to go any [far] her, in favor of immersion, than truth shall compell him; and there will be peculiar value in the admissions forced from his reluctant pen.

On the much contested passage, Matt. iii. 11, "I indeed baptize you *with* water," he renders *en hudati* "in water."

On Mark x. 38. "Baptism also, among the Jews, was a thing to be shuddered at, inasmuch as the whole body was dipped in a stream, however cold." * * * "He was *covered over* [as a person baptized is with water] with his passion."

On John iii. 23. "πολλά, *many* [waters]. So the rite of immersion required."

A very valuable contribution to sacred criticism has recently been given to the public, in the first volume of "A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical, with special reference to ministers and students, by JOHN PETER [illegible] D. D., Professor of Theology at the University of Bonn." The translation from the German into English, is by PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D.

Of John's baptism, Dr. Lange says:

"This baptism was administered by immersion, and not merely by sprinkling." p. 68.

"Ver. 6. *And were baptized*, immersed, *in the Jordan, confessing their sins.* Immersion was the usual mode of baptism, and the symbol of repentance. According to Meyer, repentance was symbolized by immersion, because every part of the body was purified. But in that case, the whole body might have been washed without immerson — We must keep in view the idea of a symbolical descent into the grave or the death of sin, although this view, as explained in Rom. vi. could not yet have been fully realized." p. 70.

"Ver. 11. *I indeed baptize you in* (ἐν) *water* (immersing you in the element of water) *unto repentance.*

"*He shall baptize*, or immerse, *you in the Holy Ghost and in fire.*— He will either entirely immerse you in the Holy Ghost, as penitents, or if impenitent, he will overwhelm you with the fire of judgment (and at last with hell-fire.)" p. 72.

"Baptism implies a descent into the depths, 1. of self-knowledge; 2. of repentance; 3. of renunciation of the world; 4. of the self-surrender to the grace of the Lord." p 75.

In Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*—the most complete Bible Dictionary we have yet seen, and which ought to be in the hands of every Bible student—the article on baptism is evidently written with a view to steer skillfully through the controversial difficulties, with as little offense as possible to any party. The writer is nevertheless compelled to say:

"The Latin Fathers render βαπτίζειν by *tingere* (*e. g.* Tertull. *adv. Prax.* c. 26, "Novissime mandavit ut tingerent in Patrem Filium et spiritum Sanctum"); by *mergere* [as Ambros. *De Sacramentis*, lib. ii. c. 7. "Interrogatus es, Credis in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem? Dixisti, Credo; et mersisti, hoc est sepultus es"]; by *mergitare* [as Tertullian, *De Corona Militis*, c. 3, "Dehinc ter mergitamur"];

* "A Dictionary of the Bible, comprising its Antiquities, Biography, Geography, and Natural History. Edited by William Smith, LL. D. 3 vols. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1863."

see Suicer *s. v.* ἀναδύω. By the Greek Fathers, the word βαπτίζειν is often used, frequently figuratively, for to immerse or overwhelm with sleep, sorrow, sin &c. * * * Hence βαπτισμα properly and literally means *immersion.*"

"*The Mode of Baptism.*—The language of the New Testament and of the primitive fathers sufficiently points to immersion as the common mode of baptism. John the Baptist baptized in the river Jordon, [Matt. iii.] Jesus is represented as 'coming up out of the water' after his baptism [Mark i. 10]. Again, John is said to have baptized in Aenon because there was much water there [John iii. 23; see also Acts viii. 36]. The comparison of baptism to burying and rising up again [Rom. vi. Coll. ii.] has been already referred to, as probably derived from the custom of immersion. On the other hand, it has been noticed that the family of the jailor at Philippi were all baptized in the prison on the night of their conversion [Acts xvi. 23], and that the three thousand converts at Pentecost [Acts ii.] appear to have been baptized at once: it being hardly likely that in either of these cases immersion should have been possible. Moreover, the ancient church, which mostly adopted immersion was satisfied with affusion in cases of clinical baptism—the baptism of the sick and the dying."

The reader will notice here the evident anxiety to avoid offense to Pedobaptists, by throwing in a weak inferential plea for pouring in certain cases. Of the same character is a note at the foot of page 90 of the Supplement: "It is unquestionable, however, that in Mark vii. 4 *baptizesthai* is used, where immersion of the whole body is not intended." These caveats, thrown in so anxiously, prove that the testimony so roundly given for immersion, are given because of the sheer force of truth, and not because the writer is partial to immersion. Nor can we help noticing the contrast between the *positive* statements as to the meaning of the term, and the practice of the primitive church,—and the feeble, halting apology for affusion which the writer attempts: "hardly likely that immersion should have been possible"! Did the writer pause to think that he had just been asserting so positively that immersion is the *proper* and *literal* meaning of the term; and that it is "hardly likely" that the inspired writer would tell a falsehood in affirming of the jailor's family, and of the Pentecostian converts, that they were immersed, if their immersion had not been "possible."! His statement, if it have any force does not so much affect the meaning of the word, as the credibility of the sacred writer! Equally puerile is the note on Mark vii. 4.—Would any one argue, concerning the English word immerse, if used to describe an immersion of the hands, or the head, or the feet, that

because the whole body was not immersed, therefore the word in this instance must mean to sprinkle or pour?! Cannot the word immerse, in its proper and full meaning, be as correctly applied to the hands, or to the arms, or feet, as the whole body? And if so, is this not as strictly true of the corresponding Greek word? Certainly. This, therefore, is sheer nonsense. Yet we are glad to give this attempt at argument, because, as already remarked, it proves that the admissions made in behalf of immersion, spring from no prejudice in its favor, but are compelled by the force of truth, in spite of strong opposing prejudices.

How strange—nay, how humiliating is it—in the light of these constantly accumulating testimonies, that men of learning should attempt to impose on themselves and on the public, by the reckless statement that immersion is nowhere taught in the Scriptures!

I. E.

METANOEOO, METAMELOMIA.

We give in this number, from Trench's *Synonyms of the New Testament*, the discussion on the above words, which have always awakened much interest in the minds of the thorough students of the New Testament. Any additional light leading to a fuller knowledge of the meaning of these important words, must be welcome to us.

We were happy in being confirmed in our view of the importance of the study of the synonymy of the New Testament, by the remarks of Dr. Ellicott, on this point in his preface to the first edition of his *Critical and Grammatical Commentary* on the Epistle to the Galatians. "The Synonyms of the Greek Testament," says this learned author, "a *most* important subject, have been greatly neglected. We have a genial little volume from one who always writes felicitously and attractively on such subjects." This refers to Dr. Trench's first volume; and Dr. Elicott's wish expressed in the same connection, "that an author who has begun so well, will continue his labors on a more extended and comprehensive form," has been measurably fulfilled by the second volume of *Synonyms of the New Testament*, already noticed in the *Harbinger*, and from which the following chapter is taken.

C. L. L.

"It is a frequent statement of our early theologians that μετανοια and μεταμελεια, with their several verbs, μετανοειν and μεταμελεσθαι, are used with this distinction, that where it is intended to express the mere desire that the done might be undone, accompanied with regrets or even with remorse, but with no effective change of heart, there the latter

words are employed; but where a true change of heart toward God, there the former. It was Beza, I think, who first strongly urged this difference between the words. He was followed by many; thus see Spanheim, *Dub. Evang.* vol. iii. dub. 9; and Chillingworth [*Sermons before Charles I* p. 11]: 'To this purpose it is worth the observing, that when the Scripture speaks of that kind of repentance which is only sorrow for something done, and wishing it undone, it constanly useth the word μεταμελεια, to which forgiveness of sins is nowhere promised. So it is written of Judas the son of perdition, Matt. xxvii. 3, μεταμεληθεις απεστρεψε, he repented, and went and hanged himself, and so constantly in other places. But that repentance to which remission of sins and salvation is promised, is perpetually expressed by the word μετανοια, which signifieth a thorough change of the heart and soul, of the life and actions.'

"Let me, before proceeding further, correct a slight inaccuracy in this statement. Μεταμελεια nowhere occurs in the N. T.; only once, if we may trust Trommius, in the Old. Hos. xi. 8. So far as we deal with New Testament synonyms, it is properly between the verbs alone that the comparison can be instituted and a distinction sought to be drawn; though, indeed, what is good of them will be good of their substantives as well. The statement will need also a certain qualification, as will presently appear. Jeremy Taylor allows this.—His words—they occur in his great treatise, *On the Doctrine and Practice of Repentance*, ch. ii. § 1, 2—are as follows: 'The Greeks use two words to express this duty, μεταμελεια and μετανοια. Μεταμελεια is from μεταμελεισθαι, post factum angi et cruciari, to be afflicted in mind, to be troubled for our former folly; it is δυσαρεστησις επι πεπραγμενοις, saith Phavorinus, a being displeased for what we have done, and it is generally used for all sorts of repentance; but more properly to signify either the beginning of a good, or the whole state of an ineffective, repentance. In the first sense we find it in St. Matthew, υμεις δε ιδοντες ου μετεμεληθητε υστερον του πιστευσαι αυτω, and ye, seeing, did not repent that ye might believe Him. Of the second sense we have an example in Judas, μεταμεληθεις απεστρεψε, he "repented" too, but the end of it was he died with anguish and despair. . . There is in this repentance a sorrow for what is done, a disliking of the thing with its consequents and effect, and so far also it is a change of mind.—But it goes no further than so far to change the mind that it brings trouble and sorrow, and such things as are the natural events of it. When there was a difference made, μετανοια was the better word, which does not properly signify the sorrow for having done amiss, but something that is nobler than it, but brought in at the gate of sorrow. For η κατα Θεον λυπη, a godly sorrow, that is μεταμελεια, or the

first beginning of repentance, μετανοιαν κατεργαζεται, worketh this better repentance, μετανοιαν αμεταμελητον and εις σωτηριαν. (unto salvation). Presently, however, he admits that 'however the grammarians may distinguish them, yet the words are used promiscuously,' and that it is impossible to draw so rigid a line of distinction between them as some have attempted to do. This to a considerable extent is true, yet not so true but that a predominant use of one and of the other can very clearly be traced.

Μετανοειν is properly known *after*, as προνοειν to know *before*, and μετανοια after or later knowledge, as προνοια foreknowledge; which is well brought out by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* ii. 6): ει εφ οις ημαρτεν μετανοησεν, ει συνεσιν ελαβεν εφ οις επταισεν, και μετεγνω, οπερ εστι, μετα ταυτα εγνω· βραδεια γαρ γνωσις, μετανοια. ('If he repents for the sins he has committed; if he comes to a full knowledge of his errors, and and recognizing what he has done (after the deed) repents—which means, that he came to the knowledge of his acts after they were committed;—for μετανοια is a tardy (after)-knowledge.") At its next step μετανοια signifies the change of mind consequent on this after-knowledge. At its third, regret for the course pursued, resulting from the change of mind consequent on this after-knowledge; 'passio quædam animi quæ veniat de offensa sententiæ prioris,' (a certain passion or suffering of mind, which comes from an injury done to a previous conviction or opinion.) as Tertullian (*De Pœnit.* 1) affirms, was all that the heathen understood by it. At this stage of its meaning it is found connected with δηγμος ('gnawing pain'—'remorse'). (Plutarch, *Quom. Am. ab Adul.* 12). Last of all it signifies change of conduct for the future, springing from all this. There is not of necessity any ethical meaning in the word in any of these stages of meaning—the change of mind, and of action upon this following, may be for the worse as well as for the better; thus Plutarch (*Sept. Sap. Conv.* 21) tells us of two murderers, who, having spared a child, afterwards 'repented' (μετενοησαν) and sought to slay it; μεταμελεια is used by him in the same sense of a repenting of good (*De Ser. Num. Vin.* 11); so that here also Tertullian had right in his complaints (*De Pœnit.* 1): 'Quam autem in pœnitentiæ actu irrationaliter deversentur [ethnici], vel uno isto satis erit expedire, cum illam etiam in bonis actis suis adhibent. Pœnitet fidei, amoris, simplicitatis, patientiæ, misericordiæ, prout quid in ingratiam cecidit' ('The heathens treat the matter of repentance in a very unreasonable way,—they apply it even to good deeds. They repent of fidelity, love, sincerity, patience, pity, just as anything has turned out contrary to their wishes.') The regret may be, and often is, quite unconnected with sense of any wrong done, of the violation of any moral law, may be simply

what our fathers were wont to call 'hadiwist' (*had I wist* better, *I* should have acted otherwise); thus see Plutarch, *De Lib. Ed.* 14; *Sept. Sap. Conv.* 12; *De Soler. Anim.* 3: λυπη δι αλγηδονος, ην μετανοιαν ονομαζομεν, 'displeasure with oneself, proceeding from pain, which we call repentance' (Holland). That it had sometimes, though rarely, an ethical meaning, none would of course deny, in which sense Plutarch (*De Ser. Num. Vin.* 6) has a passage in wonderful harmony with Rom. ii. 4.

It is only after μετανοια has been taken up into the uses of Scripture, or of writers dependent on Scripture, that it comes predominantly to mean a change of mind, taking a *wiser* view of the past, συναισθησις ψυχης εφ' οις επραξεν αξιοποις (Phavorinus), a regret for the ill done in that past, and out of all this a change of life for the better. This is all imported into, does not etymologically nor yet by primary usage lie in, the word. Not very frequent in the Septuagint (yet see Eccles. xliv. 15; Wisd. xi. 24; xii. 10, 19; and for the verb, Jer. viii. 6), it is frequent in Philo, who joins μετανοια with βελτιωσις (*De Abrah.* 3), explaining it as προς το βελτιον η μεταβολη, "the change for the better," (*Ibid.* and *De Pœn.* 2); while in the N. T., μετανοειν and μετανοια are never used in other than an ethical sense. It is singular how seldom they occur in the writings of St. Paul, μετανοειν only once, and μετανοια not more than four times.

"But while thus μετανοειν and μετανοια gradually advanced in depth and fullness of meaning, till they became the fixed and recognized words to express that mighty change in mind, heart and life, wrought by the Spirit of God; 'such a virtuous alteration of the mind and purpose as begets a like virtuous change in the life and practice' (Kettlewell) as we call repentance; the like honor was very partially vouchsafed to μεταμελεια and μεταμελεισθαι. The first, explained by Plutarch as η επι ταις ηδοναις, οσαι παρανομοι και ακρατεις, αισχυνη, 'the shame for lawless and licentious pleasures,' (*De Gen. Soc.* 22), associated by him with βαρυθυμια, 'bitter grief,' (*An. Vit. ad Inf.* 2) by Plato with ταραχη, 'agitation of mind,' (*Rep.* ix. 577, *e*) has been noted as never occurring in the N. T.; the second only five times; and on one of these to designate the sorrow of this world, which worketh death, of Judas Iscariot (Matt. xxii. 3) and on another expressing not the repentance of men but of God, Heb. vii. 21; and this while μετανοια occurs some five and twenty, and μετανοειν some five and thirty times. Those who deny that either in the profane or sacred Greek any traceable difference existed between the words, are able in the former to point to passages where μεταμελεια is used in all the senses which have been here claimed for μετανοια, to others where the two are employed as convertible terms, and both to express remorse (Plutarch, *De Tranq. Anim.* 19); in the

latter to passages in the N. T. where μεταμελεσθαι implies all that μετανοειν would have implied. Matt. xxi. 29, 32. But all this freely admitted, there does remain, both in sacred and profane use, a very distinct preference for μετανοια as the expression for the nobler repentance. This we might, indeed, have expected beforehand, from the relative etymological value of the words. He who has *changed his mind* about the past is in the way to change every thing; he who has an *after care* may have nothing but a selfish dread of the consequences of what he has done; so that the long debate on the relation of these words with one another may be summed up in the words of Bengel, which seem to express the exact truth of the matter, allowing a difference, but not urging it too far (*Gnomon N. T.*; 2 *Cor.* vii. 10):

'Etymologically, μετανοια refers to the *mind*, μεταμελεια to the *will*; so that the former indicates a change of *views*, the latter of *concern*, or rather of desire and endeavor. * * * Both, therefore, are said of him who repents of his deeds or purposes;—whether this repentance be good or evil, whether of a good or evil thing, whether accompanied by a change of action for the future, or not. But, if we look to the actual use of these words, μεταμελεια is a common, middle word—that can indicate either a good or a bad act, and refers especially to *single* actions; but μετανοια, especially in the New Testament, is taken in a good sense, and denotes a repentance for the whole life, and particularly our own, or that entire blessed change of mind, after our errors and sins, with all the affections entering into it, that is followed by *fruits* worthy of it. Hence comes that μετανοειν is often in the imperative, μεταμελεισθαι never; in the other places where μετανοια occurs, you may substitute μεταμελεια, but never the reverse.'"

Now.—"Now" is the constant syllable ticking from the clock of time. "Now" is the watchword of the wise. "Now" is on the banner of the prudent. Let us keep this little word always in our mind; and whenever anything presents itself to us in the shape of work, whether mental or physical, we should do it with all our might, remembering that "now" is the only time for us. It is, indeed, a sorry way to get through the world, by putting off till tomorrow, saying, "Then I will do it." No! this will never answer.—Ex.

Faith and works are as necessary to our spiritual life as Christians, as soul and body are to our natural life as men; for faith is the soul of religion, and works, the body.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

DAVENPORT, Sept. 4th, 1865.

BRO. PENDLETON:—The reading of Chronicles, in your September number, on instrumental music in churches, has suggested, that if we had an inspired definition of "worship," it would help to bring that wordy controversy to a close. Now, if we had such an authoritative definition, it would only remain to inquire whether instrumental music, as a part or an adjunct of Christian worship, was in the definition or out of it, just as we inquire whether infant sprinkling is in the commission or out of it.

If there is nothing in the New Testament that amounts to definition, then let every church do as seemeth it good. Let the churches worship so far as the Lord has dictated, and let them supply what may be wanting to suit the present "tastes" and "progress." This is just what the churches are doing. Some have no music of any kind. Some have vocal music only; others have vocal and instrumental music; and another has "music and dancing." And now, in the absence of definition, "Who art thou that judgest?"

If the Christian Scriptures do not settle the ordinances of worship, then let Quaker or Shaker worship as he please; then why this reluctance to "take the step"? But I assume we have a definition, or that which is equal to it.

"But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

The Samaritans worshiped, and the Jews worshiped, but neither of them worshiped the "Father in spirit and in truth." "Ye worship ye know not what," said Jesus to the woman of Samaria. Their worship was neither in spirit nor yet in truth, for God neither dictated the object nor the form. The form of the Jewish worship was of divine ordination; therefore it was in truth, but it was not in spirit, else why should Jesus say, "The hour cometh and now is"? If this language has any meaning, it must be this, that even the Jews did not worship the Father in spirit and in truth, before the Messiah. "We (Jews) know what we worship."

That the Jewish worship was not spiritual in the sense of this definition, will appear from the following considerations: Their priests conducted their worship. These were "made after the law" of a "carnal commandment." Their "law made nothing perfect." Their "ordinances of divine service were in a worldly sanctuary,"—

"which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them till the time of reformation."

The heartless, unspiritual timbrel, harp, and the ten-stringed instrument, were in perfect harmony with this pompous Jewish worship. Let me here quote from Bro. Challen, author of Chronicles. He says, "The pomp and splendor of the Jewish worship ceased when the Christian institution was established." The Jewish religion was national; the Christian personal; one appealed to the senses, the other to the understanding." Instrumental music makes its appeal to the senses; is therefore *sensual*, and something separate and distinct from the mind, or man's spiritual nature. Its appeal is the same in every case, as uniform as the appeal of flavors or odors. Its appeal is the same to the dancer, and the worshiper. There is no Holy Spirit in a Melodeon, therefore there can no Holy Spirit come out of it. An Organ cannot speak a 'psalm,' a 'hymn,' or a 'spiritual song,' and therefore it can be no part of a spiritual worship, and is out of the definition: "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." This worship cannot be mixed up with the organ and the organist, with a mere machine and an operator, which always constitute the chief attraction, whether in the parlor or the church.

To worship "in spirit," implies that the spirit of the worshiper must be devotedly engaged in the exercise, and to worship 'in truth,' implies that the ordinances of worship are of divine appointment.—"Howbeit, in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." The Jews added the "washing of hands, cups, pots, etc.," to the worship God had commanded. Now their worship was still more pompous and very exacting. "Why do thy disciples eat bread with unwashed hands?" "Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites," &c., was both rebuke and self defense.

Let me quote again from Chronicles: "It is easy for us to see that in process of time, what others have done before us will be done by us, whatever of evil or good may follow." I hope not. "I would not surrender one inch of ground, if thereby I could obtain full and peaceful possession of all the rest." Bro. Challen has only yielded a reluctant consent to instrumental music for the sake of peace. In this, as in other cases of "improving the worship of the Lord somewhat, without affecting the substance," a continual clamor may worry the conscience into silence, and then into acquiescence. But it must not be so with the few remaining pioneer pleaders of the *restoration*. We may have peace in purity. In Christianity, purity takes precedence. "Blessed are the pure;" "Blessed are the peacemakers."—The wisdom that cometh down from above is first pure, then peaceable,

Let me ask, how can instrumental music be introduced into our churches, without giving it the weight and authority of law? First, it is decided by a majority of a church, that an instrument shall be an 'adjunct' to our congregational singing, which is an important part of our public worship. Now the minority must yield, be their convictions what they may. Then the additional expenditure of instrument and salary. I forebode in this violent and continuous strife. Indeed resistance will be a virtue. Before we can as a people consent, we must stand upon another platform.

We will ask, from "whence" is this? "from heaven or of men?" Give us the precept, or the example. If we had neither, there would be no controversy among us. Besides, to many who are entitled to some respect, there is something wholly incompatible with their notions of New Testament worship.

Instruments of the right kind, in connection with the human voice, are a splendid pageant; hence the lust for them, and hence the objection, inasmuch as Jesus Christ has not ordained any thing for ostentatious display. Such music makes a tremendous appeal to the senses, to the animal man. But Christianity appeals to the understanding and the heart, and out of regenerated hearts and "purified souls," it calls forth the utterances of joyfulness and praise to God and the Lamb.

And finally, that exposition of worship Jesus Christ gave to the woman of Samaria, to which she called his attention, has in my judgment ruled instrumental music forever out of the question; for if it constitutes a part of the worship, it is worship, true or false.

Remember, brethren, you *must* worship the Father in spirit and in truth; this will save you from a mixed worship, and from a cold-hearted formalism.

I have no desire to engage farther in this discussion. I felt it my duty to say this much, as I cannot be an idle spectator of the great questions, whether profitable or otherwise, among us.

J. HARTZELL.

Lost wealth may be re tored by industry; the wreck of health regained by temperance; forgotten knowledge restored by study; alienated friendship smoothed into forgetfulness; even forfeited reputation won by patience and virtue; but who ever looked upon his vanished hours, recalled his slighted years, stamped them with wisdom, or effaced from heaven's record the fearful blot of time? The foot-print on the sand is washed out by the ocean wave; and easier might we when years are fled, find that foot-print than recall lost hours.—*Mrs. L. H. S.*

ABOUT COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS FOR PREACHERS.

NO. 2.

We argued in our last number against a separation of schools for the ministry from our Colleges. We labored to show that this would tend to secularize our literary institutions, and rob them of what ought to be their chief glory, strength, and salvation,—an all-pervading religious power. We have still more to say in the same direction.

We plead for a sanctified system of education in our Colleges, as the only true idea of a *Christian*, as opposed to a mere secularized, education. This point we shall never yield. We, therefore, demand that every possible power in harmony with, and tending to, this great end, shall be brought into our Colleges to aid in so glorious a work. We want, then, in the bosom of our Colleges, as a potent, sanctifying influence, those young men, who have, by the power of the Holy Spirit, so gloriously triumphed over the ambitions of the flesh, as to devote themselves for life to the mission of preaching the Cross.—We need, and must have, and by the help of God, we will have, this mighty power in our literary institutions, to make *them* what we all desire they should be. It is the experience of all thoughtful teachers in our Colleges and Universities, that there is no influence so potent in purifying the moral atmosphere of these institutions, as the presence of a large number of truly pious, godly young men. It is indeed, indispensable to this end. All the power of a faculty, with the best code of laws, will fail where this influence is largely, or altogether, wanting. And where a college lacks in its heart-current a powerful, predominating moral,—we prefer to say religious,—influence, it is a school of evil, and not of good. It is a terrible state of things in a college where the few pious have to live, in the midst of a controlling majority of the godless, a life of isolation and exile. And yet,—be the truth spoken fearlessly,—such for a long time has been the state of many Colleges and Universities; the world has long since felt this, and hence the wide-spread distrust of them so generelly entertained. We are familiar with the history of the older Colleges in the old and the new world, and know well whereof we affirm. Yet, in spite of many terrible facts connected with these institutions, they still flourish and increase, because they are an indispensable necessity. The world must and will have the higher order of learning they furnish. We firmly believe, from what we have seen, that this reproach can be taken away, and a true Christian ideal realized, by bringing to bear upon them every regenerating, saving,

influence in our hands. We demand, then, that the men that are to be, and are, "men of God," the chosen of the Lord in the ministry, shall be, and remain during the whole course of their education in our Colleges, as an integral part of them, to aid in making them what they ought to be. We do not know whether every one of our Christian readers can fully sympathize with us in the plea we are here making. But of one thing we are perfectly assured; and that is, that every pious College professor, who has earnestly prayed and striven for the purity and peace,—the true success,—of the College, will fully appreciate the force of our argument, and the earnestness of our words. Those only who have for years anxiously labored in our Colleges; who, far from being satisfied with leading an idle, literary, professor's life, careless of all but emolument or the literary, philosophical gratification of the mind, but have had the highest objects of human life,—the eternal interests of humanity, as the end of their labors, and have therefore desired that the College shall be a place of pure life,—*these* know the value of a predominating moral power among the students.

It may be objected, that it is presumed that the student for the ministry is to pass a course at the College first, and then to go to a separate preachers' school. To this we answer: First,—a large number who will attend the latter will not go to the former, from necessity or choice. The influence of this class of excellent men will be lost to the College. Secondly, we want *all* of them during the *whole* of their preparation. It will no doubt often be the case,—at least we hope so, and shall strive to bring it about,—that men already in the ministry, will find it profitable to spend a few months in the earlier years of their ministry, at these schools. The presence of such men would be of especial weight and value to our institutions.

But we have not yet done with this plea. We protest against separate institutions, in the interest of the preachers' school, as well as of the College. We do this by adverting to the true idea of an education. Many imperfect, false, notions are current on this subject. The mere communicating and storing up of a certain amount of knowledge, on this or that subject, is not education. "Much-knowledge," says an ancient sage, "does not educate the mind." The chief object and the highest result of education, is the development and expansion of the mind and the soul in their powers and emotions, and the freeing of them from the tyrannizing dominion of ignorance with its blinding, destructive passions. This is the true reason and purpose of the circle of a liberal College course. It is the intellectual development, and the consequent liberation of mind from the fetters of ignorant prejudices, that is of such great value, and next to

the blessings of the Gospel, the highest earthly possession. Now the entire influence of a literary institution of high order tends to this desirable result. We want to bring the student for the ministry, whether he will take a full College course or not, into the full enjoyment of the good influences of the College. He mingles freely with every variety of educated mind, in the students and the teachers; observes the various subjects and processes of the college course; learns to understand and appreciate the purport, the meaning and value of these; and it would be strange, indeed, if by all this,—that would be freely open to him,—he would not be greatly benefited, and be much better prepared for battling with the world of mind, in the work of the ministry, than if his whole course of education were limited to a theological school. We add to this,—and experience has demonstrated the truth of it,—that coming in contact with a wider range of thought and knowledge, has often awakened new desires and a higher endeavor in the generous, large-minded student. It has often occurred that a young man, that has come to college with a very limited object, when he saw how very narrow the range of his knowledge and purposes was, and how much could be learned, has been nobly stirred up with a more generous ambition, and by a patient devotion has reached far higher results than he at first saw or strove for. Some of our best men have thus providentially heard the voice, 'Come up higher!' and have followed it successfully onward and upward.

Again, should we not have an eye on our Colleges as a most important field for the work of God in the conversion of souls?—and beyond this, for the winning of young men, nobly endowed, for the work of the ministry? Now, what would be a more effectual means to this end than a preachers' school in the very heart of the College, as a part of its very life? What better instrumentalities to this end, than hearts themselves nobly sacrificed to the preaching of the Cross, longing to lead others to the ranks of the joyous reapers for the great harvest field; and the glory of the evangelical life, with its pure and lofty aims and its transcendent virtues and rewards, constantly held up by discourse from the professor's chair, and the pulpit, and in prayer, and in conversation? This is no vain hope. Enough has been already seen to assure us of what can be done in this respect by establishing a truly *evangelical* school, in spirit as well as in form, in the bosom of our Colleges. And why should all this be lost by a separation of these?

Another great point to be gained is, to concentrate the devotion of our brotherhood. To have too many institutions would divide both their affections and their liberalities. It is no very easy task to build up an institution of character and power. It requires very large ex-

penditures to do this, as the history of colleges has abundantly proved. To build the requisite buildings, to secure libraries, and above all endow professorships, is a task far beyond the conceptions of most people; and institutions not thus well fitted out must live a very weak and precarious life. Better by far concentrate our efforts, and produce something worthy of a great people, and of a great object, than dissipate our power in various directions. In *one* institution the same libraries, for example, could be open to all, literary and ministerial students; divide, and you would have to duplicate these. So with College buildings, a matter of no small moment. Dr. Liebig, writing lately to a friend in this country says,—"In America you commit the error of expending enormous amounts on College Buildings, while the professorships are limited and starved." This is too true. Any ordinary building will cost about 50,000 dollars; —this would go far to establish two good professorships. We trust our brethren will be wise in this respect, and learn from the past.

We have now always at our institutions young men preparing for the ministry, whose course of study would allow them during their college course to enjoy the benefits also of a special course for preachers. So again, others coming to attend especially to the preachers' course would have an opportunity of enjoying, if they desired it, which must often be the case, the advantages of lectures in the literary department which would be open to them. All these reciprocal advantages would be lost by a separation, or would have to be supplied at a heavy double cost.

Another very important consideration in this connection is, that it is of the highest importance to concentrate our intellectual talents in forming Faculties. Faculties are not so easily created as some suppose. If we have men fit for such places, let us bring them together, and not scatter them, that they may form together a strong power, mutually sustaining each other, and together sending forth a much greater influence on the body of students, than if they were "divided in Jacob and scattered in Israel." Concentration and co-operation is the secret of great power; separation of weakness. If the professors in the literary and scientific departments are what they should be,—men of God,—they can give strong aid in the ministerial course. This would not only much lessen expenses, but also have a good effect in inspiring the whole institution with one mind and spirit. The whole institution should be a unit in one great work.

We trust the considerations we have offered on this point, viz., the entire unity of our educational work as a people, will be pondered by our brethren; and we trust they will be received in the same free, confiding spirit in which they were written. To us, devoted in all our

soul to this great work of a true Christian education of our people, on a liberal scale, the success of what we conceive to be the only true plan of action, is a matter of deep concern. We should be deeply grieved to see any serious mistake made, that would imperil this success. We have great confidence in the sound judgment of our brethren, and believe they will not disappoint this confidence. Above all things, however, let us realize the true idea of a *Christian education* in our institutions of learning, in all the elements thereof,—the course of instruction and the teachers! Guard this point with uncompromising determination, and sleepless vigilance!

We have a few words more to say, more directly, on the question of preachers' schools, but shall leave them for another paper. C. L. L.

SHOWING HIM A MIRACLE.

"Ernest Renan having said, in his *Life of Jesus*, that the proper way of proving the reality of a miracle is to show one, a pamphleteer "shows" him one in a letter "Upon the Establishment of the Christian Religion," as follows:

"'SIR:—Permit me to-day to draw your attention again to the establishment of the Christian religion, a fact upon which we naturally differ in opinion. Like you I have striven to identify its cause with the mere forces of man. I have failed in my endeavor. The supernatural, then, has been the only conducting thread which has helped me to escape from the labyrinth, where I see you continually seeking to rectify yourself, without ever doing it, and condemned to escape therefrom only when you shall have proved that there is nothing miraculous in the establishment of Christianity. Pardon this little digression; I go straight to the work. There is a religion called the Christian, whose founder was Jesus, named the Christ. This religion, which has lasted eighteen centuries, and which calls itself the natural development of that Judaism which ascends near to the cradle of the world, had the apostles for its first propagators. When these men wished to establish it they had for adversaries:

The national pride of the Jews;
The implacable hatred of the Sanhedrim;
The brutal despotism of the Roman Emperors;
The railleries and attacks of the philosophers;
The libertinism and caste spirit of the pagan priests;
The savage and cruel ignorance of the masses;
The faggot, and the bloody games of the circus.
They had an enemy in

Every miser;
Every debauched man;
Every drunkard;
Every thief;
Every murderer;
Every proud man;
Every slanderer;
Every liar.

Not one of the vices, in fact, which abuse our poor humanity, which did not constitute itself their adversary.

To combat so many enemies, and surmount so many obstacles they had only

Their ignorance;
Their poverty;
Their obscurity;
Their weakness;
Their fewness;
The Cross.

If you had been their cotemporary at the moment when they began their work, and Peter had said to you: "Join with us, for we are going to the conquest of the world; before our word pagan temples shall crumble, and their idols shall fall upon their faces; the philosophers shall be convinced of folly; from the throne of Cæsar we shall hurl the Roman eagle, and in its place we shall plant the cross; we shall be teachers of the world; the ignorant and the learned will declare themselves our disciples!" Hearing him speak thus, you would have said: "Be silent, imbecile!" And as you are tolerant from nature and principle, you would have defended him before the Sanhedrim, and have counselled it to shut up the fisherman of Bethsaida and his companions in a madhouse. And yet, sir, what you would have thought a notable madness is to-day a startling reality, with which I leave you face to face."

Short Prayers.—Much is lost in prayer for want of brevity. If brevity is the "soul of wit," it is no less the life of prayer. Christians are not always heard for their much speaking, neither does the value or efficiency of a remark increase with the length thereof.—Length should be secondary to depth. Let us pray for what we need; do our errands at the throne of grace with as much dispatch as is consistent with propriety, talk to the point, and stop when our duty is done. Volunteer service is not only ineffectual, but positively injurious. Much may be gained by a due observance of the miller's creed, "Always shut the gate when the grist is out."

THE CLEVELAND CONVENTION.

The late Convention of Evangelical Denominations in Cleveland, is a most significant event. It was held for the purpose of devising new means for evangelizing the world. This is practically a confession that the present mode of procedure is a failure. This being true, it would have been well to inquire into the causes of this failure before devising new means, lest perchance they be found in the *manner* rather than in the means. It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. This cannot be a mistake; yet Paul intimates that it can easily be made of none effect, by the manner in which the preacher comes before the world. The thing which he especially feared would have this effect, is found in preaching with the "wisdom of words." This has undoubtedly taken two forms in the modern Pulpit, eminently calculated to destroy the efficacy of the Gospel.

1. Instead of talking to the people in a practical way, with a *purpose* before him, the preacher generally employs his whole power in sermonizing. He aims to produce a sermon that has every rhetorical feature of a fine literary essay, rather than mould his auditors to a certain work. No advocate in our courts would do such a thing.—No politician desirous of carrying the votes of those who hear him, would spend his time in any such way. Were these men to pursue such a course, their opponents would not long be at a loss to account for their failure. The *true* Rhetoric that succeeds in these things, will succeed in the pulpit. This is one way in which the "wisdom of words" makes the gospel of none effect.

2. There is another much more pernicious form of this same "wisdom of words." It manifests itself in endeavoring to go beyond the record, to be wise above what is written, and to rely on things that God never ordained to the salvation of the world. To illustrate what is here meant; it is remarkable that the apostles never had any *theory of conversion whatever*. They simply knew that "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believed," and they never inquired *how* it saved them. They did not explain that the Truth by enlightening the mind changed the heart, nor that the Holy Spirit impressed it upon the heart; but preached the commandments of Christ—preached repentance and the remission of sins in obedience to him. The attempt to go beyond this to inquire into the philosophy of this process, is to occupy the energies of the Pulpit in debating what has no bearing on the conversion of the world, and is a wisdom of words that renders the preaching of the word of none effect, both

by confusing the mind of the hearer, and by breaking the force of the cross, by exhibiting to the world a divided and contentious church.—*He who erects any theory of conversion into an article of faith, commits the crime of dividing the church of Christ about a non-essential.*

The truth of the foregoing is fully illustrated in the history of the church after the death of the apostles. Immediately the whole great learning and intellect was employed in the development of theological dogmas. It matters not that many of them were conclusions legitimately drawn from the Bible. The Holy Spirit put the premises in the Bible because they had to do with the conversion of the world and the development of piety and good works in the church, and left out the *conclusions* because they had no direct bearing upon these objects. The discussion not only absorbed the time and energies of the pulpit, but also diverted men's minds from piety and good works, and introduced strife, than which there is nothing more calculated to destroy these things in the heart. This state of affairs was so prevalent, that all the names that have come down to us, come only with the fame of controversialists. A man was famous in proportion as he beat back the forces of an opposing opinion. This folly has not passed away with the ages. It is true to-day, that if a young man of mind gives himself to the Lord and to the church, he expects and is expected to make himself useful by intellectual and polemic achievements, rather than by turning men from their evil practices and developing the piety and zeal of the churches. This is all wrong, and destroys the efficiency of the cross by the wisdom of words. They only are wise and shall shine as stars, who convert men from the error of their ways and turn many to righteousness.

This is one phase of the cause of failure and the loss of moral power by the pulpit. There is still another, of as much if not more importance. God's great controversy with the world is with its *wickedness* rather than with its *errors of opinion.* He has given us all truth that does or can underlie all moral science, but he has not given it to us for its own sake, nor that it may develop moral science, but to develop *moral agents.* Those who use it for that purpose, who make the beams of this light bear upon the *sins* of the world, are letting the light shine as God would have it, and those who do not so use it, are putting the light under a bushel. Is it not a shame to see religious organizations, and schools, the handmaidens of the church, so solicitous for the truth they hold that they will take a neutral position on all the great moral questions that underlie society, lest by doing otherwise they should compromise that truth. *The truth is of no manner of use unless it regenerates.* If the church—the salt of the earth—has lost its savor, IT IS GOOD FOR NOTHING—it has lost its moral power, and *God has no use for it.*

Righteousness is the great power of the pulpit, and unless it emphasize this, it will and ought to fail.

This regenerating force of the gospel, if made to bear on the morals of the world, will constantly, like the internal forces of the earth, be crushing up through the stratifications of ages, and in the ever changing phases of society, present new forms of sin and new moral questions to be decided by the light of God's word. And as God never raises up a man or a church to work in the past, but always for the future, that man or church or institution that expects to be blessed by God, must ever be found in front of his age with a banner of Righteousness.

S. E. Pearre.

JAMAICA MISSION.

LETTER FROM BRO. BEARDSLEE.

To the Disciples of Christ a hearty greeting:

Dear Brethren:—A few weeks since, I sent you, through the "Record," a frank statement of my personal circumstances and of the wants of the Jamaica Mission, offering my services for that field again, if enabled to enter upon the work free from embarrassment, and suitably provided with means to carry it on successfully in the future. The action of the convention at its late gathering in Cincinnati, touching the Mission, will have been conveyed to you, by your messengers, and through our periodicals. The Committee appointed to report on the Jamaica Mission, recommended that it be vigorously prosecuted, and that a brother be sent out as soon as possible to superintend the work there. This recommendation was followed up by pledges on the spot of over two thousand dollars, and subsequently by the passing of a resolution "requesting the Board to send out Bro. J. O. Beardslee to Jamaica at the earliest possible period." I am now able to state that the Board at its meeting on Friday the 20th inst. passed a unanimous resolution in accordance with the "request" of the Convention and voted an appropriation of $3200 for that field during the coming year. This is the lowest sum that can in any tolerable degree meet the wants of present laborers, including myself, for the current year.

The arrearages of myself and the Mission still remain to be met.—To relieve me fully, place my family in a position to be left without anxiety, and to pay the amount due on the chapel in Kingston, will require *fifteen hundred dollars* ($1500).

I am anxious to return at as early a day as possible, but believe it best for the cause to tarry in this country till I can go untrammeled.

The Board agree with me in this view of the matter, and recommend a personal appeal to this end.

The season of the year, and the interests of the Mission, make it desirable that I should soon be on the way. I have yet to break the matter to the church of which I am pastor, and to provide for the wants of my family for the winter, but could accomplish all this in 20, or at most 60 days, and be in Jamaica by the opening of the new year, if not obliged to visit brethren in person, to obtain the funds required.

Will not every brother and sister whose eye may rest on this letter, enclose such an amount as, before God, they may feel able to contribute? I cannot come to your door, or even visit the churches withou expense, and the support of my family must be met in the meantime. Be your own agents in this matter—save time, save money, honor your Master, by prompt, voluntary, liberal offerings.

This appeal will be sent to the *Harbinger*, *Review*, and *Record*, and your offerings shall be acknowledged through the same, just as soon as the amount is realized. I shall enter upon my preparation without delay, and nothing shall detain me unnecessarily, for an hour, after your response to this call. Don't be afraid of giving too largely, don't be ashamed to give a small amount, if it is all you are able to do.—Much or little, let it be accompanied with your prayers for the blessing of God, and you shall soon hear a report that shall make your hearts glad.

Need I say more? Grace, mercy and peace be with you all.

Yours in the service of Christ, J. O. Beardslee.

P. S. Enclose your offerings addressed, Hudson, Summit co., O.

Marysville, O., Oct. 24th, 1865. J. O. B.

LETTER FROM THE COR. SECRETARY OF A. C. M. S.

Bro. Pendleton:—The Cor. Sec. of the A. C. M. Society would beg leave, through the Harbinger, to call the attention of the brethren to the work before, us and to ask their co-operation in the same.—The object of this Society is to spread the gospel in this and other lands. This is a good, a great work, a work for which we pray the living God to give us strength.

Brethren, we ask your cordial support. Without this we can do nothing. Shall we have your assistance, that we may from time to time, be enabled to make to you such reports as will gladden your hearts, inspire you with confidence; and that we may vigorously and hopefully push forward in the great work, in which we as a people have been so long engaged?

The black clouds of war are now dispelled. Fields wide and

bright are opening up before us. Let us strive mightily to meet the demands at home and abroad, that thousands may rejoice in the forgiveness of sins, and that the Lord our God may be glorified.

Deeply and solemnly impressed with the fearful magnitude of the task before us, we enter upon our labors. Our trust is in the living God, the righteous cause we plead, and in a just and generous brotherhood, who abound in every good work.

We pray God to bless his people and to make them a blessing to those who are destitute of the gospel of Christ.

All letters and contributions are to be sent to me at Cincinnati Ohio, Box 966.

W. C. Rogers, Cor. Sec. A. C. M. Society.

Cincinnati, Ohio, Oct. 24th, 1865.

THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

In this number of the *Harbinger* there will be found an appeal in behalf of our general Missionary Society by its Corresponding Secretary, and another one from Bro. Beardslee. There should be a general awakening all over the land among our brethren in the great, uncontrovertible, interests of this truly evangelical co-operation of the Christian brotherhood. The present hour is a most auspicious one for the realization both of the need of such an organization, and of its great usefulness. God has done a wonderful work in our own land, which the Christian should be able *first* and *best* to understand, in all its great significance. He should at once clearly discern the voice of God calling him to go forth to these millions politically emancipated, but yet fearfully enslaved by darkness of soul and its effects, and bear to them the precious boon of knowledge, and above all, the light of life, that tens of thousands among them may realize the glorious words of Jesus, "If the Son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed;" and "If the truth shall make you free, you shall be free indeed;"—and the song of the evangelic prophet, —"He hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prisons to them that are bound, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all them that mourn; * * * * that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that He might be glorified;" (Is. lxi: 1–3). The true Christian sees far more than a political work and a political significance in this wonderful change; nor is he satisfied with this feature of it only. All that has been thus far done, *he* accepts only as an efficient means to a far greater end,—the enlightenment and the *spiritual* redemption

of this race in our land. The spiritual salvation of men, is evermore the end of all things with the church; all else, however rejoicing, is but a means to one great end. If the Christian people of this nation,—and we may say, of other nations also,—now fail to come forth with joyful gratitude and with abundant power to redeem this race from ignorance and sin; if they fail to go to them with "the *fullness* of the blessings of the Gospel of Christ," all their pretensions hitherto of sympathy for this race, will be proved false, and God the Most High, who has so visibly made bare his arm, will have a fearful reckoning with them. Christian people! consider this well.

But our land, to-day, needs especially in all parts of it the work of the Gospel. The effects of the great convulsions that have shaken and affected society for the last four years, call loudly for the regenerating, saving, work of the Gospel. *Now* the church must come forth "clear as the sun, fair as the moon, and terrible," in its might to conquer, "as an army with banners," to grapple with and subdue the powers of darkness. The hour of need is the hour of courage, and of putting forth great strength. We believe that this is a chosen day of God for the church, to manifest its spirit and its "strength in the Lord and in the power of his might." We believe that it is a good hour for the mission of the Cross in our own land.

But not only is this an auspicious day for the evangelical work in our own land, but also in many other lands. Not only is "Ethiopia stretching out her hand," but "the islands of the sea are waiting for his law"; literally is this fulfilled to us to day. Jamaica is appealing to us, and from "the ends of the earth," from far Australia, the Macedonian cry is coming, calling for the word of Life. And no long preparation is needed for preaching the gospel in these places. They speak our own language. And that the Word of Life will prosper in these regions, is also already demonstrated. Shall we joyfully answer this cry? And this is the work not of State Missionary Societies, nor of individuals, or of individual churches, but of all in combined and organized effort. This place the general Missionary Society alone fills. There are other parts of the earth where we ought long since to have established successful missions. Germany is one of these. In no foreign land, of foreign speech, could the plea for apostolical Christianity be more successful than there.—This we know from many facts; but the wonderful success of Oncken has demonstrated it. Our plea could surely not fail to reveal as full a power as his, if we entered upon it with the same apostolical devotion and sacrifice.

Two things, however, are now especially and indispensably necessary to the success of our general missionary cause. To this mat-

ter we desire most earnestly and particularly to call the attention of our brethren. There are two great obstacles in the way; two great *wants*, in the strictest sense of the word, among us yet in the missionary work. First, we lack true missionaries. We ask no pardon for saying this; we know it is true. We do not mean that we have no missionaries at all; this would not be true. But there is yet a serious want here. To preach the gospel in our highly favored Christian land, in the midst of the comforts of Christian society, among kindred and friends, is one thing, and to go far away into foreign lands, leaving home, kindred and friends, and the comforts here enjoyed all behind, to labor in the Gospel, is quite another thing. Where a hundred will have strength to do the former, not one will have the inspiration and apostolical zeal and bravery to do the latter; but to be ready to do *this* work, is what we mean by the true missionary spirit; the spirit that is yearning to bear the tidings of salvation to men everywhere at any sacrifice. How many have announced themselves ready for this? How many such missionary *converts* has our general Miss. Society found?—men ready to say,—"Here am I, send me"? There is a call now, well supported too, for two missionaries for Australia. How many have answered the call? Oh, we must pray for mighty conversions yet for such a work among the young men preparing for the ministry! We must "pray for laborers for the great harvest field" everywhere. Another point, in this connection, we cannot but advert to here. All over our land there are places, important places in the true evangelical policy, too, where often we have small churches; where there is most pressing need for able, true, evangelists; where much could be done in establishing the cause of primitive Christianity; but where there are no comfortable emoluments, no easy places, no good salaries; where labor and sacrifice alone call upon us, and await us. Many such places are well known,—"known and read of us all"; and where are the men of apostolical zeal and love, *offering* themselves for such places? Where are the young men going forth into the ministry seeking with the true yearning of the missionary spirit, for such opportunities of glorifying God, in "spending and being spent" as preachers in such places? In the bitterness of grief the heart is oppressed in seeing the reluctance manifested in this direction; in seeing how these "poor" places, so rich for noble labor and sacrifice, so fitting to win a noble crown, are coldly passed by; and how good, remunerative positions are so constantly sought for. Where are the *young* men in the ministry, burdened with but few of the cares of life, who are ready joyfully to do their Master's work in these fields? Who hears and heeds the voice of God in the Macedonian cry from these neglected places? Oh,

Lord, revive thy work in our midst! May the spirit of the apostles and primitive evangelists, and of the early preachers of this reformation, come upon us again!

The second great want yet among us, to which we desire to refer, is this,—that we do not seem generally to realize what sacrifices it demands of us, to do a great work in the Gospel mission. Nothing is more obvious than this. We have not yet come up at all to the full measure of sacrifice in this direction. Look at the facts. *A very few thousand dollars* is all this General Society has *for a whole year* in its hands to accomplish its world-wide mission! If the pure gold, the real missionary amount, is taken from the annual report accredited to the general liberality of the church, for this general purpose, —how small it would be! A great general Mission Society, with not as many thousand dollars per annum as there are months in the year,—after so many years of existence, of experience and general enlightenment on its work and duties, in the midst of so numerous a people and so many years of prosperity,—is this the proof of a great interest, and is this the token of great results? Until we learn to realize the magnitude of the work, and meet the realization by far greater liberalities than we have ever brought to light,—until we give hundreds where we have given tens, and thousands where we have given hundreds,—rely upon it, the work will not prosper. The widow's mite has always been blessed,—the stinted gifts of abundance never. We may as well come to this decision now as at any later time, that a very much greater sacrifice than most have hitherto dreamed of in their philosophy of giving, of sowing and reaping, must be brought forward, if any great thing is to be accomplished. This standing and shivering on the brink of a gospel sacrifice in liberalities, this terror at leaping into this Rubicon once for all, will cripple any great and good effort. The whole history of God's work among men, is one of great *sacrifices*; mighty sacrifices alone will win crowns! Sacrifices, that have astonished the carnal world, of treasure, of labors, of sufferings, of lives innumerable, alone have brought the gospel to our age and to our homes and hearts. Who can deny this? And let us be assured, *great sacrifices* alone will crown the cause of the Redeemer with great victories in the future. Unsavory as such declarations doubtless are to many, we rejoice to know that they find a response in the hearts of many, and we fearlessly make them, because we know they are *true*, and the interests of the gospel of Christ demand that they should be made. Yet we are full of hope. God's good work will surely be accomplished among men. This age will not pass away unmarked by great results in the gospel mission over the world. The indications of God's purposes among the nations are

great and marvellous. They confirm our faith and hope in the truth and victories of the cross. But blessed are they whose hearts and hands shall be diligently engaged in the Lord's work on the earth!

Let us not allow any one to awaken in our hearts a distrust of the Missionary Society; on the contrary, let us gather around it with renewed devotion and zeal. We know its Board to be true and trustworthy men. May increased prosperity and success mark its coming years, to the praise of His holy name. C. L. L.

BIBLE UNION MEETING.

New York, Oct. 30, 1865.

Dear Bro. Pendleton:—I came here with my wife to attend the sixteenth Anniversary Meeting of the American Bible Union Society. The meeting embraced two days, the 25th and 26th inst., and was well attended from almost all parts of our common country, a few from Canada, one from England, and one from Hayti. Several things of interest came up before the Society: 1. The New Testament as now finally revised, at least for the present, by the Final Committee. Under this head it was shown, by various specifications, that during the past year many changes had been made on the former edition from the Final Committee, and that now in this second edition, which is an octavo, and which will be ready for distribution within a few days, we have for the present the finishing touch of this Committee.—They now propose to revise the Old Testament, commencing with the book of Genesis. From the remarks and specifications, and various parts of the corrected manuscript that I saw, I should judge that the present edition is quite an improvement on the preceding one, especially as to English dress; but there are other changes that it seems to me they should have made at once, for they certainly must be made in time, and thus save the religious world from so many corrected editions from the Final Committee. I only state here my convictions in general terms, without any specifications, and may at some future day give the reasons for these general conclusions. I would here state in conclusion on this point, that I have been during the meeting very fully impressed with the honesty of purpose of the Final Committee. And I do hope and trust before God, that they will at all times and under all circumstances be enabled to rise above all religious party feeling or educational prejudice, and do a work for God and humanity, that shall tell for good for ages yet to come.

II. The distribution of these revised Scriptures, was a leading point in the future movements of the Society. In connection with

this subject, much was said about using it in the churches and Sunday schools, thus at once bringing it before the great mass of the people, and especially among the rising generation. But its circulation among the *freedmen* was the popular chord "of a harp of a thousand strings," and elicited many a warm speech in their behalf that reached down into the pockets of a goodly number of the faithful.—The providence of God in preparing this version for the freedmen, and the freedmen for it, was very beautifully and forcibly exhibited by some worthy brethren. Laying aside the fulsome cant of some ultraists on this subject, the movement is a good one. Many of these negroes are just beginning to read; and to place the Word of God in their hands in plain, simple English, is a good work for them and their race.

III. To place Dr. Conant's inductive work on *Baptizein* where it may in time do a great work for God, it was resolved to prepare an edition with blank pages, on which may be written the names of the donor and the person to whom it is given, &c., and place it in the hands of every minister of the gospel in this country, irrespective of religious parties. Several hundred dollars were also given for this purpose.

IV. The Treasurer's report showed a large increase in the receipts of this year over those of the last—footing up, to June, something over thirty thousand dollars; and it was announced that if the report had embraced the whole year, the sum would have been over forty thousand dollars.

V. Having learned that there was an increasing desire on the part of many of the members of the American and Foreign Bible Society for a united effort on the part of the two societies to circulate pure versions of the Scriptures, and fully reciprocating that idea as a society, the American Bible Union appointed a committee to meet a committee from the other society, to see what could be done in this respect, and to arrange, if possible, upon proper principles, for a union of the societies, and report to the next meeting. You will recollect that in 1849–50, a difficulty arose in the A. & F. B. S. about applying the principle of the society—to circulate correct versions of the Sacred Scriptures—to the English language, which resulted finally in a rupture in that society, and the organization of the A. B. U. Now the parent society, as we may call it, manifests a desire for a reunion in their efforts to procure and circulate correct versions in all languages of earth—the English not excepted. Nothing short of this principle will satisfy the desires of this age, and the A. B. U. did well to appoint a committee to meet them, and, if possible, to unite the two societies on this one universal principle—pure versions

in all languages of earth. If this can be consummated, and the strength and power of these two societies brought to bear on the same object unitedly, much good we may hope will be the result. The tendency of the age in religious matters is to more united and harmonious efforts, especially among Protestants; and it seems to me we should encourage and labor with all, as far as we possibly can, who are thus engaged.

There was one thing at this meeting that, I must say, I very much regretted. It was an excessive laudation of the Final Committee, by Dr. Eaton, President of Madison University, in his address. I feel sure that the Dr. meant it for the good of the society and the cause; and the Board in accepting and publishing it as a part of the documentary evidence in favor of the great work in which the society is engaged, and the means used to accomplish the work in the very best style, no doubt did what they thought was best; but they will doubtless yet see their mistake. *Truly great men need no laudation, and works of real merit will command respect and admiration.* If this Final Committee is well prepared for their work and do it well, or have done it well, the world will find it out; but to try to force it upon the world by praising either the Committee or their work, will cause sensible men to think that the managers of the society are conscious of the need of some such help. As a friend and contributor to the society, I am sorry that it has been thought advisable to either prepare or accept so much on this subject, as was read before the society the last evening of the meeting.

The meeting, other things considered, was regarded by those accustomed to attend these anniversaries, as a success. I was much pleased and gratified at the general spirit of kindness and good feeling that prevailed during the whole meeting.

We remained here over Lord's day, to be with our brethren at the opening of their new house of worship on 28th street, near Broadway. Bro. D. P. Henderson, of Louisville, Ky., gave the opening discourse, to a very fine audience; in fact, the attendance, morning, afternoon and evening, was good. One gentleman was baptized in the evening, and the prospect for a good meeting was fair. Bro. Henderson will remain for some time and speak of evenings. We became acquainted with our excellent young Bro. Brewer, who is the pastor of the church, and quite a number of our good brethren in Christ.—The brethren have here a good and neat house, a fair congregation, an excellent Sunday School, and are all in harmony and peace. If all will work as they should, and as I trust they will, I can see no reason why the cause of Christ should not triumph gloriously in this metropolis. Let the brethren from all parts of the country who go to

the city on business, meet with these good brethren whenever they can, encourage them, and worship with them. Quite a number of the brethren here have asked me to remember them to you, Prof. Loos, and Father Campbell.

Peace be with you, through Christ Jesus the Lord!

Your brother in Christ, A. E. Myers.

THE LAST WORDS OF DAVID.

BY THE DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.

In a former number we gave the name of "Songs" or "Lays of Israel" to those sacred poems, which were not included in the Psalter, but were gathered by the authors of the Historical Books of the Old Testament from the ancient collections of national Hebrew poetry now lost. "Song" is in fact but the English translation of the Greek word "Psalm,"—"that which is played or sung,"—and any offence which may be given by such a rendering is the same offence which has always been incurred by any new translation of the Bible, and which was in fact incurred by the venerable authors of our own Authorized Version.

The Song which we select in this number is of a more sacred character than the pathetic, but simply personal, lament of David over Saul and Jonathan, which occupied our attention in the last we treated of the precious fragments of Hebrew psalmody.

We will give it piece by piece with such explanations as may be needed for bringing out its full force.

> "These be the last words of David,
> The utterance of David, the son of Jesse,
> The utterance of the man who was raised up on high,
> To be the anointed of the God of Jacob,
> And the sweet singer of Israel."

The rhythm of this title shows it to be part of the song itself, whether added by a later hand, or, as is most probable, by King David himself. Four other "last words" of David are given in the Sacred Books:—One, the 72nd Psalm, "A Psalm for Solomon," which closes with the pointed expression;—"The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended." The Psalm expresses all the hope and confidence which David reposed in the future of his glorious successor. Another is the splendid expression of religious munificence, in the closing chapters of the 1st Book of Chronicles, where he bequeathes to the same son the charge of building the Temple. A third is the

less pleasing, but still characteristic, union of fierce revenge, and tender gratitude for past services, which breathes through his parting injunction to Solomon to remember the child of his old benefactor Barzillai, but to bring down to the grave the white hairs of the aged Joab and the aged Shimei. But those which follow are in a pre-eminent sense "the last words of David;" for they express at once the light and shade, the strength and weakness, of his whole reign and character.

"*David the son of Jesse*,"—so he remains to the end; always with his family affections fresh and bright—his father and his early kinsmen never forgotten amidst his subsequent splendor; the water of his ancestral well of Bethlehem is still dear to him (2 Sam. xxiii. 5); one whole book of the Sacred Scriptures—beautiful as it is in itself—seems to have been incorporated for the special purpose of giving the origin of the family of the aged Jesse,—or the history of Ruth, the mother of Obed, who was "the *father of Jesse, the father of David*." (Ruth iv. 17.) "*The man who was raised up on high*."—This was the feeling that never deserted him—the sense of the marvellous change which had placed a shepherd-boy on the throne of a mighty empire—one of those surprises which we so often meet in the Bible, and which makes it, if we may so say, a focus of innocent revolution to the whole of Christendom; we are led by it constantly to find elevations and blessings where we should least expect: the ordinary commonplace routine of life is continually broken up: "He raiseth up the poor out of the dust, and lifteth the needy out of the dunghill; that he may set him with the princes, even with the princes of his people." (Psalm cxiii. 7.) "The last shall be first, and the first last." (Matt. xx. 16.) "*To be the anointed of the God of Jacob*."—Anointed by Samuel in his early youth—anointed by the chiefs of Hebron on his first accession to the throne—but through these human hands and human agencies, he sees the hand and agency of God Himself—"the God of Jacob,"—an expression not without significance, as showing that at that time the story of Jacob—his wanderings, his repose on God's care—were familiar to David and his people. It is with him a favorite expression,—as if from a recollection of the likeness of his life to that of the persecuted patriarch. "The generation of them that seek thy face, O Jacob." (Psalm xxiv. 6). "He vowed to the mighty God of Jacob." "He sought a habitation for the mighty God of Jacob." (Psalm cxxxii. 2, 5). "*The sweet singer of Israel*." "Pleasant in the songs of Israel." It may be that he thus describes himself as endeared to the nation through his own songs,—or that he is the darling of the songs of his people, as when the maidens sang, "Saul has slain his thousands, and David his tens of thousands."

And now comes "the prophecy,"—the "divine outpouring" of his soul,—for this is the meaning of the phrase which he uses, and which is expanded in the words which follow:—

"The Spirit of Jehovah speaks in me,
And his strains are on my tongue—
The God of Israel said to me—
The Rock of Israel spake."

It was the "breath" or "spirit" of Jehovah that passed through his frame, and His poetic "strains" (the phrase here used only occurs in poetry) that dwelt on his tongue—the words of Him who was the ruling God and the central Rock of the whole nation.

"He that ruleth over men justly—
Ruling in the fear of God—
So is it, as the light of the morning, at the rising of the sun—
A morning, and no clouds—
After a clear shining, after rain, tender grass springs from the earth."

This is the ideal of a just reign—whether, as looking back upon his own, or forward to that of Solomon. Here is the same comparison of the moral and natural world that appears in the 19th Psalm. "Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. His going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it: and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof. The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes." The ruler just to men, and reverent towards God, suggests immediately the brilliant sunrise in the East: the cloudless sky above—the grass, so exquisitely green in those dry countries, immediately after rain, and glistening in the sunbeams.

But he has hardly caught this vision than, whether in prospect or retrospect, it is instantly overclouded. "The difficulties which follow arise mainly from the crowding together of the characteristics by which the thought of the Old Testament is distinguished from our own. In the vividness with which it expresses every feeling, every inward and outward experience, no modern language can compare with the Hebrew. The image or idea which is before the mind at each moment is presented in its utmost distinctness and force, and seems to occupy the whole horizon to the exclusion of every other. The present absorbs the past and the future, and the relation of each

part to the whole of which it is a part is lost in the fulness of immediate vision. In this song this characteristic is increased by the concentrated emotion of the speaker; for deep emotion even in other languages tends to Hebraize—to omit all but the engrossing idea, and forget the logical relations and connections of thought. There is no want of clearness in the isolated expressions—rather the contrary.—The idea of a righteous king which it is the calling of David's house to realize—the fear that some of his house may fail of realizing it, the certainty that, should they fail, God's covenant cannot fail—and the vehement denunciation of rebels against the ideal king—all stand out vividly, however we may construe the details of the passage."*

We must pass to each of these parts as best we may.

"For not so (or, 'is not so'] my house with God—
For an everlasting covenant He made with me, ordered in all things and sure
For this is all my salvation and all my desire—
Assuredly he will not cause it to grow [or 'will He not cause it to grow']."

It is hard to unravel these entangled sentences; yet they seem to present in a short compass the two trains of thought drawn out at length in the 89th Psalm—the contrast between his hopes of what his dynasty might be, and his fears of what it will be; and underneath both hopes and fears the confidence that the Divine promise which pledged a long future to his race will continue. It is a prediction, but a prediction wrapt up in that undefined suspense, and that dependence on moral conditions, which so well distinguish the predictions of sacred prophets from the predictions of pagan soothsayers. It shows that Nathan's warning (2 Sam. vii. 1, 11, 12; xii. 1–7), both of good and evil, had both sunk deep into the mind of the King.

"But the men of ill—like scattered thorns are they all, for not with the hand does one grasp them.
And the man that shall touch them
Must be fenced with iron and the wood of spears.
And with fire they shall be burnt and burnt on the hearth."

He turns from the apprehensions for his house to the apprehensions of those who had troubled his own reign from first to last. "The sons of Zeruiah are too hard for me" is the constant vexation of his life. It breaks out in the 101st Psalm, when he dedicates his household to God. "I will behave myself wisely in a perfect way. O when wilt thou come unto me? I will walk within my house with a perfect heart. I will set no wicked thing before mine eyes: I hate the work of them that turn aside; it shall not cleave to me." It breaks

* I have this passage from a friend—a Hebrew scholar.

out in the dying charge to Solomon against Joab and Shimei. He contrasts the soft delicate green of the kingdom in its prosperity to the thorny thickets which can only be approached with axes and long pruning-hooks. These are the evil growth of the court even of a righteous king; to root and burn them out is his duty as much as the encouragement of the good.

It is a melancholy strain which closes a song which begins so full of brightness and joy. But it is a true picture of the chequered life of David, and of the chequered fortunes of the ruler amongst men.—It is a true picture of the struggles and hopes, the "broken lights" of the human heart, whether in Judæa or in England, whether of king or peasant. If there be a part of Scripture which shows the movements of the human individual soul, it is this precious fragment of David's life. If there be a part which claims for itself, and which gives evidence of the breathing of the Spirit of God, it is this also. The contrast between a high ideal of life and the inadequacy of the instrument to which we are compelled to resort in the actual conflicts of life, is one of the sorest trials of a sincere and gifted soul that has to fill a place in the world. It is a trial to which the secluded saint, or the commonplace Christian, is a stranger. But to those who have to march on through the highway of life, and yet are not contented without looking higher, the last words of David express at once their difficulty and their consolation. Those few green spots in life "in the clear shining after rain"—that bright morning, not yet overcast with clouds—sustain them in their long dusty journey, and under the dark sky, with the belief that there is above and beyond this world an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and sure—according to which all things work together for good.—*Good Words.*

WHO AND WHAT IS AN EVANGELIST?

He is not an apostle, not a prophet, not a pastor, not a mere teacher, nor even a mere preacher, but a combination of the preacher the teacher and the exhorter. We have no formal definition of an evangelist in any one section of the apostolic epistles. Paul the great apostle to the nations does no where give us a formal definition of an evangelist. He defines the bishop, the elder and the deacon, but nowhere formally defines the evangelist.

He indirectly alludes to his office in his second letter to his beloved Timothy. 2 Tim. 4. 5. It is in these words;—"Watch thou in all things, endure hardships, do the work of an evangelist, fulfill thy ministry."

Some of our cotemporaries say—"The evangelists were next in order to the apostles, and were sent by them, not to settle in any particular place; but to travel among the infant churches, and ordain ordinary officers, and finish what the apostles had began." Of this kind were Philip the deacon, Mark, Silas &c.

The office of a modern missionary in most respects answers to that of a primitive evangelist. The title is more particularly given to the four inspired writers of our Savior's life.

From all our readings of the first and second centuries of the Christian Institution, and from Eusebius the oldest church historian in Christendom, whose Folio now lies before me, London Edition, A. D. 1709, we are more fully confirmed in the conclusions to which we had come concerning the proper, and, indeed, the peculiar work of the Christian Evangelist, or Christian Missionary, for, in all truth, the work is so identical, that either name in all Christian propriety equally represents the work to be done. So that we may in all propriety say,—a Christian Evangelist is a Christian Missionary and a Christian Missionary is a Christian Evangelist. They are equally the messengers of the Christian church, and their work is to announce the Original Gospel, with its evidences, and with all its claims upon the understanding, the conscience, and the heart of every alien, every sinner, of every rebel, to whom they can gain access. Being a matter of fact, a matter of faith, and not a doctrine, not a philosophy, not a theory, not a speculation, it is to be simply stated, or as Paul said, *declared*, with all earnestness, and sincerity as a positive message sent from the Lord Jesus Christ, emanating from the everlasting philanthropy of his Father and our Father, from his God and our God.

The true and earnest-hearted evangelist will present its glorious facts, its exceedingly rich and precious promises, its transcendent claims upon the understanding, the conscience, and the affections of every man that has a mind to appreciate, or a heart to respond to the tender mercies and the loving kindnesses of the father of all our mercies and the God of all grace. The truly educated Evangelist will not turn aside to theories, to speculations, to the doctrines or traditions of men living or dead. He will wholly ignore them.

He will rather say, God forbid, that I should turn aside to expose heresies, to trifle with theories or speculations or false doctrines, or the follies of theorists and speculations, orthodox or heterodox. He will dwell upon the all-transcendent riches, glories, honors tendered by the Father of all mercies and the God of all grace, to every undone sinner who will cordially accept the overtures of his unspeakable philanthropy.

A. C.

THE GOSPEL.

We have long since offered to our numerous and diversified readers sundry objections to the popular preacher's modes of sermonizing and theorizing on insulated verses or periods or scraps of sacred Scripture. We have, indeed, realized a very considerable improvement in pulpit oratory, both in preaching and in teaching the gospel. Still there exist sundry defects in some of our most estimable and deservedly popular preachers and teachers of the Christian Institution. We occasionally hear a single verse made the standing topic of an hour.—It may, indeed, sometimes be worthy of it, on account of a given, or supposed, audience on a certain occasion; but in the common occurrences of a given community, it is neither acceptable nor profitable.

I have now before me a scrap of paper which furnishes me with seven *texts*, which when I had noted down, I thought might suffice me for seven weeks. I will transcribe it by way of illustration.

The preamble is in the following words:—The word *gospel* occurs in the Christian Scriptures, in three forms, *one hundred and thirty-six* times. We have *euaggelion*, the gospel,—*euaggelizoo*, I preach the gospel,—and *euaggelistees*, the evangelist, or he that preaches the gospel.

We shall now propound or declare the seven Facts that constitute the whole gospel. They are,—

1. The birth of Christ; God being his Father and the Virgin Mary his mother.

2. The life of Christ; as the oracle of God and the beau ideal of human perfection.

3. The death of Christ; as a satisfactory sacrifice for the sin of the world.

4. The burial of Christ; as a prisoner of the grave.

5. The resurrection of Christ; "O grave! I will be thy destruction."

6. The ascension of Christ; "He ascended up far above all heavens, that he might possess all things."

7. The coronation of Christ, as Lord of the universe. God his Father constituted him the absolute Sovereign of creation.

The birth of Christ was indicated by Moses, the oldest historian on the pages of time. In Genesis 49, 10th, he says: "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." And Isaiah, the evangelical prophet, has said: "And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of

the people. To it shall the Gentiles seek; and his rest shall be glorious." "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left, from Assyria, from Egypt, from Pathros, from Cush, from Elam, from Shinar, from Hamath, and from the Islands of the sea" (Great Britain an Ireland). "And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed from Judah, from the four corners of the earth. The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off; Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim. But they shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines towards the west; they shall spoil them of the east together: they shall lay their hand upon Edom and Moab; and the children of Ammon. And the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea, and with his mighty wind shall he shake his hand over the river, and shall smite it in the seven streams, and make men go over dry shod. And there shall be a high way for the remnant of his people that shall be left from Assyria; like as it was to Israel, in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt." Isa. xi. 10–16.

The birth of Jesus the Christ is, of course, the first topic. His human ancestry, maternal and paternal, his nativity, his kindred, his native country, his associates, his manners and customs, the character of his cotemporaries, his manner of preaching and teaching, his miracles, his persecutors, his death, his burial, his resurrection, his ascension to heaven, his coronation, his mission of the Holy Spirit, his administration of the affairs of the whole universe, his second coming, his resurrection of the dead, his final judgment of angels, men and demons, his creation of a new universe, new heavens, new earth, all things new;—these are themes in harmony with the cravings, desires and necessities of humanity in all its phases, desires, and aspirations.

The present material universe, yet unrevealed in all its area, in all its tenantries, in all its riches, beauty and grandeur, will be wholly regenerated. Of this fact we have full assurance: since he that now sits upon the Throne of the Universe, has pledged his word for it, saying, "*Behold, I will create all things new*;"—consequently "new heavens, new earth,"—consequently, new tenantries, new employments, new pleasures, new joys, new ecstasies. There is a fullness of joy, a fullness of glory, and a fullness of blessedness, of which no living man, however enlightened, however enlarged, however gifted, ever formed or entertained one adequate conception.

A. C.

BIBLE UNION ANNIVERSARY.

We have received from Bro. Buckbee a synopsis of the proceedings of the Anniversary of the Bible Union for the present year, as given in the *Examiner*, and which we publish below. From this account, as well as from Bro. Myers' letter in this number, it will be seen that the meeting was one of a good deal of interest. Several circumstances made it so. First, there were delegates present from many quarters not represented for a number of years at these anniversaries, as from the Southern States. The presence also of our distinguished visitor from Great Britain, Sir Morton Peto, whose noble name has now become familiar to us all, and the short speech he delivered, added much to the general interest. It is really a cheering sight to see a man engaged in and controlling such great business enterprises, engage so earnestly in religious matters. Secondly, the Final Committee announced their work on the New Testament completed, an event so long anxiously looked for. The final improvements indicated below, are certainly good ones, and such as we were assured would have to be made at last, to meet the just demands of our age. We should be glad to see that the Final Committee has given us in this mature fruit of their labors on the New Covenant, a work that will stand the test of a just criticism. Thirdly, the financial report was certainly very cheering, and gives token of renewed interest in the Bible Union among its friends. Finally, a matter that excited a good deal of interest in the meeting, as it will also among the friends of the B. Union everywhere, is the proposition to enter into negotiations with the American and Foreign Bible Society, for a union of these institutions upon a common basis. Dr. Armitage's declaration, as reported below, certainly, if properly understood and carried out, no true Christian man can possibly object to. For our part, we accept it with all our heart. So will our brethren. This is precisely what we have been laboring for in this Reformation,—to "unite all who love, preach and practice God's ordinances in their purity,—all who love God's pure Word,"—not only in one "Bible organization" in the form of a Bible Society, but also in one Bible organization, as the true church of God. The Lord of heaven speed the day of so glorious a consummation! We hope, however, the Bible Union will yield not a jot or a tittle of its distinctive ground on the important question of Bible translations and circulation. Indeed, it is now impossible for such a surrender to be made. The battle of the last fifteen years on the question of pure translations, has been so grand, so comprehensive, so widespread, and finally, so victorious for the

truth, that we, the friends of pure versions,—or what is the same, and better said,—of the pure Word of God, may lift up our banners in the name of God, and praise his great and holy name for the triumphs already gained. Not only have eminent Christian scholars all over the Christian world declared loudly in favor of our position, but the light shed abroad by the discussion of this question, has won the hearts of the people to the acceptance and support of the truth.—Indeed, all opposition to pure versions is vain; it must yield at last. Every day we meet with new testimonies from high sources, and from all parts of the enlightened Christian world, to this great truth. It is God's cause, and the victory must be his. As Luther, in the inspiration of one of the great moments of his life, sang in his immortal "Song of Faith,"

"The WORD against its foes shall stand!"

"There fights for us the true, right man,
Jesus Christ is his name,
The Lord God Sabaoth,
The victory shall be his!"

The B. Union is publishing a large Octavo, Family and Pulpit Edition of the New Testament as finally revised. Bro. Buckbee informs us that this edition is very beautiful, and that it will be bound and ready for circulation in about two weeks. C. L. L.

"Bible Union Anniversary.—The American Bible Union held its Sixteenth Anniversary on Wednnsday and Thursday of last week, in the First Baptist church of this city. The attendance was good, and the meetings spirited and harmonious. Good delegations were present from New-England, Canada, and from the Western and Southern States. Georgia, Alabama, North Carolina, Kentucky and Virginia, were represented. Sir S. Morton Peto, from London, was present and addressed the Union on the second day.

"The old officers were all reappointed for the ensuing year. The report of the Board shows a gratifying condition of affairs, and refers to the wants of the various fields heretofore cultivated by the Society. Mr. Wall, an English missionary in Italy, says that a million copies of the Testament ought to be circulated in that land. The Spanish Testament should receive a wider distribution in Mexico and in Spain. Our missionaries in Asia also ask for greater aid from the Union.—In the home field 80,000 copies, in full and in parts, have been circulated since the first issue of the 18mo. Testament; and twenty thousand complete copies, up to Aug. 1, were sent forth last year—a large proportion having been distributed among soldiers, freedmen and oth-

ers, especially in the South. The work of revision on the New Testament is now done; and for the present, at least, the Union commits the results of its sixteen years' labor to the judgment of the world. Though holding itself ready to make any further improvement that *scholarship* and *truth* may require, it feels that for the present *its work on the New Testament is done;* and now its energies are to be directed to the Old.

"The Final Committee have compared notes, held correspondence, and reached harmonious conclusions on some points which were left undecided in the small Testament issued last year; and their completed work is now printed in one of the most elegant volumes ever published in this country. It is a large print, pica type, on the best of paper, and in good binding, making 500 pages, and is styled "The Family and Pulpit Edition." Of the changes which characterize this edition we notice, "demons" for *devils;* "overseers" for *bishops;* and "letters" instead of *epistles.* The termination *th* is uniformly given up. We have "speaks," "talks," "comes," "goes," instead *speaketh, talketh,* &c. The former edition is to be conformed to this. Quotations from the Old Testament are indicated, whether prose or poetry. A small Sunday school Testament is also to be prepared, and may be anticipated in a few months.

"The work of circulation among the Freedmen, and all others, was discussed at length—Messrs. Goodwin, Hillman, Judson and many others taking part; and a contribution of nearly $3,000 was made for this object. The work of the Union on the meaning of the Greek word "Baptizein," prepared by Dr. Conant, was commended by a resolution offered by Elder D. P. Henderson, of Louisville; and it was recommended that the friends of the Union, in every church, town, city, county and State, see to it that a copy of BAPTIZEIN be given to every minister in the land, immersionist or pedobaptist. The same proposition was made with reference to the Revised New Testament —two gentlemen pledging each one hundred dollars for this object, towards a fund of five thousand dollars, for, as one speaker said, *converting* the ministers to the truth in respect to baptism."

"The receipts and expenses for the past twelve months amount to *forty thousand dollars*, being an increase of one hundred per cent. over the preceding twelve months. The Treasurer's statement, however, closed June 15, with the sum of $30,000 received, and about the same sum expended, leaving about $1,100 due the treasurer.

"The speaking was generally good. Rev. Drs. Caldicott, Eaton, Wescott and Miller, made a strong and earnest defense for the enterprise. Brother Smith, of Bloomfield, delivered a well-prepared discourse on the subject. Elder A. E. Myers, of West Virginia, and

D. P. Henderson, of Kentucky, and Dr. Eleazer Parmly, of the Christian or Disciples' church, spoke earnestly for revision, as a means tending towards true Christian union.

"The most important feature of the Anniversary was the action in reference to a union with the American and Foreign Bible Society. Dr. Armitage, in his opening address, took the meeting by surprise, by declaring boldly for a union of all who love, preach, and practice Christ's ordinances in their purity—all who love God's pure word—in one Bible organization. He hoped we had outlived the rancor and prejudice and wrong feeling of the past, and that we were ready to bury it all, and rise up to a grand and glorious future, in united efforts in the Bible work. He would meet his brethren of the American and Foreign Bible Society more than half way. He would place this splendid revised Testament on the same shelf with the common version. Let each choose, take and use whichever he prefers. Our *principles* are the same. We ought to be together. Our effectiveness in the great work for God requires that in our Bible work we should no longer be twain, but one body. Rev. Dr. Eaton offered a resolution, that as the Committee appointed in 1862 found some circumstances at that time, which made it necessary to postpone the consideration of the subject, which are now removed, and that as many brethren are cordially desirous that a union mutually honorable to the two Societies may be effected, a Committee be appointed to prosecute negotiations with the Board of the American and Foreign Bible Society, looking to some amicable arrangement whereby the two bodies may be united in one. The proposition was cordially sustained by Drs. Eaton, Wyckoff, Armitage, and others, and unanimously adopted; and the following persons were appointed to confer with the Board of the Bible Society: Rev. Drs. Eaton, Hodge Weston and Sarles, Dr. Eleazer Parmly, Samuel Colgate, and Charles F. Goodwin. ***

"Sir S. Morton Peto.—This distinguished Baptist is receiving marked attention from all classes of our people, commercial, political, and religious. The Anniversary of the Bible Union was enlivened by his presence on Thursday of last week. He was welcomed by the President; and on being introduced he spoke as follows:

"Though I am filled with appointments and crowded for time, it was impossible for me to overcome my irresistible desire to be present with you for a few moments, and to say a few words. I have but one fault to find with my visit to America, and that is that my time here is too short. The kind reception I have everywhere met from American people has impressed me deeply, and I have received enlarged ideas of American progress and civilization.

"But there are objects, higher than those with which civilization

and every-day progress have to do, to be noticed. It is creditable and encouraging, that among all the mighty struggles of the last four years the American people have never ceased to do that which it was their duty to do in maintaining their religious societies and institutions almost without interruption. We of the old country feel a deep interest in all your religious movements and societies in America. I have the honor myself to be the President of the Baptist Missionary Society of Great Britain, and it has often been my privilege to meet in that capacity your missionaries on their way out to India and other distant heathen lands. We look upon them as one of ourselves. We all in England feel and know that we are one; that we are united in one Savior, and labor for one object—the advancement of his kingdom. Your Bible Society is a great society, and its work of revising and circulating the Scriptures is a great work. So also is our Society great, and its work great. But it strikes me that this work and society of yours stands forth as one of the most remarkable and interesting of your country. The condition of the South at present affords you a great opportunity to permeate the hearts of the people with the blessed knowledge of the Word of God; and it strikes me that we in England and you in America owe a debt of gratitude to the great Creator, who has taken you out of your recent National difficulties and placed you in a condition to make a start from a vantage ground you never possessed before. It is not a time for political allusions, but at the same time I cannot help saying that nothing has done so much to prevent that good feeling which should permeate every other country towards your own, as the differences of a political nature which have heretofore existed between you. The *one* great point of difference is now, thank God, removed. *Now* there is no cause of difference, and we will all feel in England that you have a great work before you in America, in bringing the people of the South to a knowledge of the everlasting truths of the gospel. Nothing will be more interesting, of all the accounts I shall take back to England with me, than the account I shall bring of your progress in this work of giving the Word of God to the nations in faithful versions. In conclusion, you will allow me to say that I called in simply to express my regret that I could not spend much more of my time among you and show more of my sympathy with every Christian in the land. Whatever our minor differences may be, we have all one Lord and Master, and by and by we will all, I trust, have but one land and one home, the most glorious that can be conceived, and which is the only thing that is worth living for here.'

"Rev. Dr. Armitage responded in a few happy remarks. He thanked him for his kind and cheering words to the Bible Union.—He thanked him for his deep interest in the general welfare of our nation: and especially he thanked him for all his noble defense of our country on the floor of the British Parliament. In conclusion he said: Though here we live under different earthly governments, we are one; and we shall soon be in the grand empire of the Lord's redeemed, under the banner of the King of kings and Lord of lords.—May the Savior bring us all together in one, in his own time, to the place which he has gone to prepare for us."

"SCHOOLS FOR PREACHERS."

Bro. Loos:—Your article in the last Harbinger under the above caption deserves a special emphasis. The best sign in these degenerate times is the conviction among our people, so wide spread and so unique, as to the necessity of teaching the Bible as a text book in all our colleges. Is not God providentially preparing a people to meet the oncoming rush at the Bible from highchurchism, Catholicism and infidelity? Who but the young preachers prepared for the conflict in our colleges, will be able, in the year 1900, to defend the Bible as to its history, its text and its teachings, against the learned opposition that is now conspiring against its very existence?

But my object is not to write a lengthy article, so much as to make a suggestion, or rather an inquiry as to how much time is to be, or can be, devoted to the study of the *Bible itself* in our colleges. My attention has been called to this by examining the course of Bible study proposed for students in Bethany College. It struck me that so much study is proposed that is merely cognate, that comparatively little attention can be given to the *Bible itself*. Rhetoric, Logic, Evidences of Christianity, Church History, and many other very useful branches are enumerated, that seem quite enough to occupy two years, if the Bible were never opened. Indeed, the Bible, although doubtless included, is not mentioned at all in your course of theological instruction. I was expecting to see a course of Bible study marked out—the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms; the Gospels, the Acts and Epistles—and in what part of the session each is pursued. That such will be the practical working in Bethany College I have no doubt; but is it not possible so to bury the Bible under a mass of other things that it will fail to appear the prominent feature of the course. We all intend to make the Bible the center, as the grand radiator of light to all cognate studies, and in that center the educator should take his stand, instead of walking the circumference and pointing to the center whenever we come in sight of it. True, there are many elevated points on the periphery from which we can get a fine look at the Bible, especially when studying Ecclesiastical History, Evidences of Christianity, and such like; but to stand in the focal point of all light and reach out to all kindred truths, and converge them so as to render the Bible most lustrous by the concentrated glory of all, is the real work to be done in all our colleges.

A young man ought to be conducted through Romans and Hebrews in the spirit and habit of a student, just as he would through Algebra, Mental or Moral Philosophy, Rhetoric or Logic. And so of all the

parts of the Bible; then, knowing more about the Scriptures than about anything else, he will talk and preach more about it, and will never be tempted to preach metaphysics for gospel facts, science for religion, nor politics more than prayer. Fill the soul with Moses and the Prophets, with Jesus and with Paul, and we'll have a preacher instead of a speculator.

These things are written not as a fault-finder, but as a means of drawing out the plans of our colleges, and especially of our common and never-to-be-forgotten *alma mater*, in teaching the Bible, and also *how much Bible* teaching is to be done in the course prescribed for our young preachers. In Eminence College we are trying an experiment. The whole school being divided into four Bible classes, spend a half hour each morning, the first recitation, and as a result, in a meeting just closing, conducted chiefly by ourselves, we have baptized about 40, including nearly all the young men in the Institution that were not members before. Nearly all the students, male and female, are now humble converts to God, a result for the most part clearly traceable to our Bible classes. In trying to carry on this work, I hope our brethren will never forget the important truth you so earnestly pressed in the October Harbinger—that none but God-fearing men—men of mellow hearts, hearts mellowed by the love of God and contrition for sin—should ever be allowed to teach a Bible class in a college. The Bible is a dangerous book to handle in college, if not handled by men who know its salvation, feel its love and its redemption. It must be made to appear what it really is, the book of heaven, the master of the conscience, the discerner of our thoughts, and judge of the world. May God bless every effort to extend its dominion over every heart, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

THOMAS MUNNELL.

REMARKS.

Bro. Munnell's words reach right to the heart of this whole matter. He is right in saying that it is not only the things *about* the Bible that we are to teach, but above all else, the things *in* the Bible. This is a leading thought before us in planning a 'School for Preachers' especially in Bethany College. If the scheme were to fail in realizing this great end, it would be a vanity, a failure indeed.

But we are happy to say to Bro. Munnell, that his questions and suggestions have anticipated what we intended to say in the next number, when we hope to speak fully to the points presented in his welcome article. In the meantime, we cannot but again declare, that we thank God that the true spirit, the spirit of God, is astir in the hearts of so many of our brethren on the important matter of the great

need, and the only proper manner, of fitting men for the ministry of the Word, and on the general question of a true Christian system of education. Let us have your voices on this subject, ye men of God!

C. L. L.

From the New York Observer.

FEAR NOT.

"FEAR NOT, FOR I HAVE REDEEMED THEE."

Deeper, Father, grow the shadows,
Darker still the night comes on;
Every human hope departing,
Now I look to Thee alone.

Hopes that I had fondly cherished
Thou hast laid in ruin low;
Props on which I lean'd have failed me;
Like a broken reed I bow.

Father, wilt Thou surely lead me
Thro' these days of fear and gloom?
May I know that thou wilt keep me
Till I reach my Heavenly Home?

Over all the distant moorland,
Stretching dark and cold away,
Say, my Father, wilt Thou lead me?
Shall I never lose my way?

Hark! I hear a voice of cheering,
Sounding thro' the gathering night:
"'Fear not, for I have redeemed thee,'
I will be thy guide and light.

"Only follow when I call thee;
Let no fear turn thee aside;
Not a foe shall dare to harm thee
While I am thy constant guide."

Father, full of all compassion,
I will take Thee at Thy word,
Meeting danger and temptation
In the strength of Christ, my Lord.

"THE EVANGELIST."—NEW SERIES.

This is the title of a new monthly published by the brethren at Oskaloosa, Iowa. It is devoted to Primitive Christianity and Education, and is edited by the Professors of Oskaloosa College, and other brethren, among whom we recognize the familiar names of J. E. Gaston and Jonas Hartzell. The first number is well filled with good matter. We place it with pleasure on the list of our exchanges.

Terms, $1.50 year, in advance.

Rank does not dignify the man; it is the man who dignifies rank.

APOLOGETIC.

Our friends are doubtless beginning to complain of us for several things which are unusual in our treatment of them, and we wish to set ourselves right before them as speedily as possible. It is unnecessary to do more than simply to state that we have been absent from home and rendered unable to do any public work by a severe attack of illness, from which we are just recovering. Again at home however, and partially restored to health and strength, we enter again upon our labors, with full heart and hope, realizing the ten thousand reasons for gratitude which surround us on every side, and deeply sensible of the Divine mercy in keeping and guiding and blessing us in so many ways, both in our public and private efforts for the honor and glory of His name among men. We have never had more reason for confidence in the permanent endowment and complete success of Bethany College than now. A degree of liberality unparalleled among us has been shown towards the Institution within the last few months, and others not yet visited are ready to show their generosity towards this great agent in building up and carrying forward the work of the Lord. In our next number we propose to render to the benevolent men who have so nobly contributed to this end the honor which is due, by a report of our success so far as we have gone. Brother Albert Allen, our financial agent, is actively at work, and every day adding to the amount of the contributions.

One more number will complete the current volume of the Harbinger. We know not what the brethren will do towards extending its circulation for 1866, but we trust many good friends will begin to act for us promptly and energetically, so that we may be encouraged by a large increase of subscribers for the next volume. May we not ask all such to begin at once to make up their clubs, so that we may know by the first of January what number to print in order to meet the demand for the year. We need not go into any special promises as to what we will do. We have already promised to procure new type, and for the rest we will only say, that *we will do our best.* Let the performance of the past be a pledge for the future. If we can do better, we will;—at least, we pledge ourselves to do as well. We hope to deserve, and trust we shall receive, increasing evidence of fraternal interest in our labors. W. K. P.

MEETING OF THE A. C. M. SOCIETY.

Bro. Pendleton attended this meeting on his way to spend a few weeks abroad in the interests of the College, and has just returned home. This explains the absence of any account of this meeting in the present number of the Harbinger. A full notice of it will appear in the December number. C. L. L.

CHURCH NEWS.

OTTOKEE, OHIO, October 25, 1865.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—I am happy to report the further triumphs of the ever blessed gospel of the grace of God. In September last, I held a meeting of five days' continuance with the congregation worshiping at Harrison, Henry co., Ohio. The meeting, although very short, was a very joyful one indeed.—Forty-four precious souls became obedient to the faith, and were added to the church. Our District Missionary Convention coming on, compelled me to leave. I am informed since the close of the meeting three others have been immersed.

Last Lord's day I visited the church at Metz Corners, Indiana, on the occasion of the dedication of their new, neat and commodious house of worship.—In the evening we gave an invitation, and five made the good confession, and the next morning were immersed. One wanderer was reclaimed. Urgent business at home made it necessary for us to return home; so we were compelled to close the meeting. Your Bro. in Christ,

L. L. CARPENTER.

OBITUARIES.

Died, at his residence in Rock Island, Ill., Aug. 4, 1865, Bro. Miles W. Conway, aged 69. He moved from Washington, Ky., in 1825 to Rock Island, then called Stephenson, and built the first house there. He had been a member of the Baptist church, and was present at the famous debate at Washington between Campbell and McCalla, and soon after embraced the principles of "the Reformation," and lived and died in the faith. He was a firm adherent of the cause, and devoted to the interests of the church. He was a member of the congregation in Davenport. His end was peace. Thus, the pioneers, who zealously gave themselves to the work of restoring the ancient Gospel, are passing away, and soon they will all go to the dust to await the first resurrection at the coming of the Lord. J. C.

TRIBUTE OF RESPECT.

ADELPHIAN HALL, BETHANY COLLEGE, W. V., Oct. 21, 1865.

Tidings having reached us that our highly esteemed brother and fellow-member of the Adelphian Society, Allen Minard, of Milton, Nova Scotia, was taken from our number by death on Sept. 20th, 1865; and since we recognized in him the true brother and exemplary Christian, we feel it our duty to give a public expression of the love we bore him while living, and the high esteem in which we now cherish his memory.

We deeply regret the loss of one so dear to us all, one who exhibited such promise of usefulness in the proclamation and defense of the gospel of Christ. With us he has left an example of unwavering faith and piety, of devotion to the service of his Master, and a firmness and decision of character making his every act so unlike the vanities, frivolities and fickleness of mind so often observed in those of tender years.

With his bereaved parents we can but drop the tear of sympathy, praying God to quickly cover up this wound in their hearts with the sweet consolations of the Gospel, and pointing them to that land where death and sorrow never come, and to which Jesus has called this loved one *now* as a guardian angel of those who are to follow.

May God bless them abundantly with all spiritual blessings, and preserve them "blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

H. McDiarmid, L. S. Brown, W. S. Atkinson, Com.

Died, of Paralysis, Aug. 10, 1865, at the residence of Brother David T. Wright, near West Union, Doddridge co., West Virginia, Brother Horatio N. Bakewell, in the 68th year of his age. Born in England, came to the United States in early life, and resided in Wellsburg, W. V., until a few years prior to his death.

Thoroughly rooted and grounded in the fundamental principles of the Gospel, it was his ardent desire to distribute the unsearchable riches of Christ to his fellow-men—and the latter portion of his life was wholly devoted to this great purpose.

He was a man of unswerving rectitude, and rigid accuracy in all his dealings with the world; and never wished to compromise principle for expediency.

Sometimes, through error of judgment, he precipitated himself into useless discussions, which were unfavorable to his spiritual good, and damaging to his usefulness; but whenever he perceived his error, he was ready to confess it, and retrace his steps to the right path.

We was a diligent student of the Word of God, and he aimed to merit His praise rather than the approbation of men.

"No farther seek his merits to disclose,
Nor draw his frailties from their dread abodr;
There they alike in trembling hope repose,
The bosom of his Father and his God."

NEW PLACE OF MEETING OF THE CHURCH IN NEW YORK CITY.

New York, October 10th, 1865.

Bro. Pendleton:—By a recent exchange of church properties, our congregation in this city is now located in 28th street, near Broadway.

We are now in possession of a very neat and commodious church edifice, in one of the most pleasant localities in the city, and one that is very accessible to all the principal hotels. This card is to give notice of the recent change, and to cordially invite all of our brethren, from every part of the country, who may visit New York, to come and worship with us. We are now engaged in some additional improvements upon the main building, which we expect to have ready for permanent occupation by the 1st of November. In the mean time we are meeting in the lecture room.

By the blessing of our Heavenly Father, we are prospering finely, and are looking foward to larger usefulness in the kingdom of our Lord.

Fraternally yours, Urban C. Brewer.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 36.] BETHANY, W. V., *DECEMBER*, 1865. [No. XII.

ADDITIONAL TESTIMONIES FOR IMMERSION.

The history of Baptism, as it stands before us, stretching through the entire compass of the annals of the church, (we use this latter term with historical freedom), presents to the thoughtful student, on all the sides of it, one of the fullest and most remarkable illustrations of the nature and life of error, especially of religious error. This,—aside from the intrinsic importance of the subject of baptism itself, makes the study of this history of great interest and value to us.—To understand well the history of the aberrations from truth, through the long past, in their causes, their life-manifestations, and their consequences, among other advantages it brings us, gives us a clearer view of the doings of men in our own day; and so far from disquieting us in our faith and in our confidence in the truth, makes us firmer and calmer in our trust, subduing a thousand fearful disquietudes, and enables us to battle with more courage and hope for truth against error.

There are some very remarkable things in the history of Baptism. The *variations* of the arguments for Infant Baptism, from its first introduction to our own day, in their number and strangeness, their scholastic ingenuities, their absurdities and perpetual contradictions, constitute themselves a very curious and not altogether unedifying and useless study. We venture to say, that were these variations all portrayed lifelike and alongside of each other in one picture, so that the eye could take in the whole at one view, the stoutest defender of this practice could not endure the sight, but would turn away with a blush of shame; for here discord, anarchy and confusion reign su-

preme. The forms in this picture to which Dire Necessity has given birth, border often on the monstrous. There is not an argument for infant baptism that has not been refuted,—not seldom in the spirit of bitter ridicule, by the defenders of this institution themselves; and the most mournful and pitiable exhibition is made by our own American, Puritanic, defenders of it, who seek for proof in the letter and practice of the New Testament. And yet the Protestant practice of this rite yet lives, although, certainly, in a decaying life.

As to the mode,—we hesitate not to say, that so far as the meaning of the word *baptizo*, the New Testament practice, and that of the early church, constitute a subject of debate, the matter stands decided before the Christian world, that is, so far as any theological question can be regarded as decided. Such is the remarkable, clearly uttered, unanimity of all whose authority is decisive on the above points, that we may safely accept the question as settled. Indeed, in saying this, we are almost quoting the very language of Pedobaptists themselves,—certainly the meaning of their language. That there are men who yet seek to sustain this practice by the letter of the Bible, is true; so there are also those who deny the divinity of Christ; yet shall we regard this great truth as undecided?

Our object is not, however, to *discuss* the question of baptism, but to offer some additional testimonies from Pedobaptist sources of our day in behalf of immersion, in continuation of Bro. Errett's contribution in our last number. The character of these testimonies we desire the reader especially to notice, as fully sustaining what we have just said of the present state of this question before the learned Christian world.

Bro. Errett in his article gave some valuable quotations from *Lange's Commentary* on Matthew. We shall add a few from the same source. This great German work is intended to comprehend the whole Bible; and to give in it the fruit of the mature labors of the learned world. Dr. Lange has called to his aid some of the first scholars and theologians in the German Protestant world, among whom the books of the Bible are distributed. The work on the New Testament is completed, and now these men are engaged on the Old Testament. Of the New Testament Matthew alone, so far as we know, has as yet been given in English. Besides the Commentary, the German original has a complete new critical translation, as the basis of the commentaries. This translation, not represented in the English version, gives some clear testimonies for immersion.

In Matthew 3: 16, instead of using the common word for baptize which is *taufen*, the translation uses the word *tauchen* (to dip, or

dive under), and gives the passage thus: "And Jesus dipped under and arose immediately again up out of the water" &c., and the commentary makes a special point on this *im*mersing into, and quick emerging again up out of, the water.

In Mark,—also the work of Dr. Lange himself, c. 1: v. 9, we have the following translation, "—came Jesus of Nazareth and was baptized of John in Jordan (properly: *down into the Jordan*, in den Jordan hinein)." The parenthetic addition belongs to the author.—This is certainly very definite, and is given as an exact rendering, admitting of no doubt. Mark 10: 38-40, is rendered: "—You know not what you ask. Can you drink the cup which I drink, and be baptized with the *baptism-bath*, taufbad, with which I am baptized? They said to him, we can! But Jesus said to them; The cup indeed which I drink, you shall drink, or the *baptism-bath*," &c.

In the Commentary on Luke, (the work of Dr. Oosterzee) 3: 21. 23, occur these words: "Perhaps we may be allowed to regard the account of Matthew, that after the immersion he arose *immediately* (εὐθύς) again up out of the water, as a significant indication pointing to a difference between his baptism and that of the Jews, who remained perhaps a longer time under the water."

In the *Acts*, the work of Dr. Lechler, Professor of Theology in Leipsic, we have the following references to immersion. Commenting on the baptism of the eunuch the author says: "The joy of the wanderer in the sand-desert, when parched with thirst he at last sees an oasis with springs of fresh water, cannot be greater than was the joy of the pious treasurer, when he beheld water in which he could be baptized."

In the Commentary on Colossians, (Dr. Schenkel, c. 2: v. 12,) we have this passage: "*Buried with him* &c. * * * The "putting off the body of the flesh" is represented in baptism, and in such a manner that it offers a likeness to the *burial of Christ*. The apostle proceeds, in the figurative expression, from the presumption that the putting off the sinful body is accomplished in the communion with the death of Christ, (comp. Rom. 6: 3), so that the old man is, as it were, sunk with the earthly body of Christ into the grave. * * * * The resurrection takes place not *in* (during) baptism, but in the coming *forth out of* baptism. This resurrection is not the bodily, to be looked for at the general raising of the dead, but the ethical, the putting on of the new man (Rom. 6: 6, &c)." Other references to immersion of similar import might be cited from Lange's *Bible Work*, but these will suffice.

Dr. K. R. Hagenbach, Professor of Theology at the University of Basle, has published within the last ten years several volumes of pop-

ular lectures on the History of the church. He stands now in the front rank of German theologians, and is especially well known as an author in the field of Church History; and even in the English world, his very learned work on the *History of Doctrines* is a standard text book. We shall translate from these Lectures some extracts in which he speaks of the mode of baptism. Speaking of the practice of the *sacraments* in the first three centuries, vol. 1 p. 324, he says: "That baptism at first was administered under the open heavens, in rivers and pools, and by immersion, is well known from New Testament history. Later, large baptismal basins, and baptismal chapels, (baptisteries) were erected. As the candidate for baptism descended several steps into the basin, and then was immersed with the whole body under the water, the figure of 'being buried into the death of Christ,' and 'the rising again out of the grave,' rose up with full power before the spirit, which in the later mode of *aspersion* was only too much lost. Aspersion was practiced at first only with the sick, who were baptized on the deathbed, and with whom baptism by immersion was no longer practicable."

In the second volume, extending from the fourth to the sixth century, page 138, he says: "Baptism was usually administered on Epiphany, Easter, and Pentecost, after the catechumens had been prepared for it. There were large basins or cisterns, especially built for that purpose, into which the candidate for baptism descended, while the baptist remained standing on the upper step. The candidate first faced the West, where darkness reigns. Then he uttered the formula of renunciation: 'I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy works, and all thy glory, and all thy service.' Then he turned to the east, the region of light, with these words: 'To thee, O Christ, I devote myself.' After he came up from the bath of baptism, he was clothed in the new garments prepared for him. Besides the immersion into the water, other significant ceremonies were practiced."

In Germany there has been lately brought to a successful termination the publication of a *Cyclopedia for Protestant Theology and Church*, a work of wide extent embracing almost every subject of interest in the field of Theological learning, including also a large number of biographies of names of note in ancient and modern church history, —all treated with the usual German erudition. Dr. Herzog, Professor of Theology at Erlangen, is the editor, and had for his co laborers a large number of the most eminent theological scholars in Germany. From the long and elaborate article on Baptism, in which the general history of this subject is treated, we make the following extract on the mode. In treating at length, as the first point, of the *Biblical Theology* of Baptism,—the author says: "Here intimately belongs the

purification from sin represented by the ablution of the body, which is indicated at one time as the forgiveness of sins, (Acts 2: 38. comp. 22: 16, and 1 Cor. 6, 11); again as purification through the water-bath in the word (Eph. 5: 26, if this expression really refers to baptism), further as the answer of a good conscience (Hebrews 10: 22, 23; compare the difficult passage 1 Peter 3: 20, 21, where the salvation in the antitypical water of baptism is illustrated by the type of the water of the flood &c.)"

"Another thought, current with Paul, is the *being buried into the death of Christ by baptism* (Rom. 6: 3, 4; Col. 2: 12), which is presented to our view by the immersion, and is expressed by the pledge of the candidate to die to sin in Christ his head. The rising again to a new life, however, while it is regarded as the consequence of this burial, is based on the faith in the power of God to raise from the dead (Col. 2. 12,) and cannot be brought into immediate reference to baptism, as βαπτιζειν means indeed an *im*mersion, but not at the same time an *e*mersion."

"The administration of baptism appears nowhere in the New Testament as the privilege of a special office; Paul, according to 1 Cor. 1: 4-16, baptized but few in Corinth, and accordingly does not seem to have regarded it as an apostolical function. Baptism was certainly always administered by immersion in running water; as enigmatical therefore, appears the obscure passage 'to be baptized υπερ των νεκρων, 1 Cor. 15: 29; for if the explanation allowed by the language, 'in the place of the dead,' is an unworthy idea, from which Paul could not possibly justify his argument, the other interpretion 'over the graves of the dead,' while it does not contradict the use of language, nevertheless leaves unanswered the question how the administration of the ordinance in such a place, could be harmonized with the then so essential idea of immersion."

Speaking of the patristic doctrine of Baptism, he says: "Three effects are constantly attributed to baptism: 1, the forgiveness of all sins previously committed (Just. Apol. 1: 64); 2, the impartation of the Holy Spirit and its gifts, (Just. Dial., 2 c. 29); 3, the implanting of the power of a divine life, which gives the victory over death and imparts immortality. * * * The first of these effects is by Tertullian (de Bapt. c. 4.) referred to the special act of baptism, that represents this already in immersion."

In Sect. 4, treating of the early Protestant doctrine of Baptism, he first refers to Luther's views. "In the first period of his notions of this sacrament, Luther, in the true Augustinian spirit, distinguished between the outward sign and the thing signified by the sign; between the two he places faith which realizes in man the thing signi-

fied. The sign is to him, therfore, immersion, the signification the new birth &c." So of Melancthon's idea. "In its symbolical sense, baptism as immersion indicates that we are baptized into the death of Christ, that is, that our sins are washed away and the benefits of the death of Christ are applied (Loci com. de Bapt.). * * * "Urbanus Regius sees in baptism a certain testimony and seal, that, as the outer man is immersed by the priest, the Holy Spirit invisibly and internally baptizes the whole man."

"In the ancient church we find as a rule baptism administered by immersion; affusion, and aspersion was practiced only in cases of sick persons, and those so baptized were called *clinici* &c."

The very thorough historical investigation of baptism by the author of this article, does not give much consolation to Pedobaptism; and although it is not our intention here to speak of the *subject* of baptism, we may be allowed to quote a few words from our author on this part of the question. He says squarely,—and we commend these words to our pedobaptist theologians of America for reflection—"That in the New Testament there is not to be found a trace of infant baptism, may surely be regarded, with a conscientious exegesis, as certainly established; all attempts to deduce this practice from Christ's words instituting the ordinance of baptism, or from passages like 1 Cor. 1. 16, ought, therefore, to be given up as mere arbitrary subtleties; indeed 1 Cor. 7. 14 positively excludes every such conclusion, or else the apostle would have grounded the sanctification of the children on their baptism, and not on their fellowship with believing parents.—Only the presumption that infant-baptism did *not* then exist gives binding conclusion to the apostle's reasoning. However, in this passage the ideal ground of the justification of infant-baptism is expressed." This *ideal* ground is now the last hope of a "conscientious exegesis," for this practice. A forlorn hope truly! We cannot forbear giving another passage from this keen, trenchant writer, to show how he handles the lame and halting arguments for pedobaptism. After treating of Dr. Martensen's new and very remarkable notion, truly, that infant-baptism is the only normal, true, idea of baptism, "because, the receptivity presumed in baptism is (to use Dr. Martensen's word) 'a general, indefinite, passive (unresisting) receptivity,'" and this is especially realized in infants he says, "In like manner others also, as Kliefoth and Hoefling have attempted to justify infant-faith in baptism. The latter describes this faith as 'the pure, passive (unresisting) receptivity for the influence of the Holy Spirit and the divine grace,' and for proof appeals to —— Augustine's letter to Boniface!" The form of this passage is the writer's own. We add here only, that to reconcile the imperative necessity of a

present faith, to justify and complete baptism, with infant-baptism, has been the heaviest cross for the defenders of this institution; and the history of their struggles under this mighty burden is very remarkable, and often very ridiculous and absurd in the extreme.

Before we conclude we shall add, as testimonies for immersion, a passage or two from American sources, never before given in the *Harbinger*. Dr. Nevin, one of the most eminent theologians of the German Reformed church in America, says: "It needs but ordinary scholarship, and the freedom of a mind unpledged to mere party interest, to see and acknowledge here a certain advantage on side of the Baptists. The original sense of the word baptize is on the whole in their favor. It corresponds with the idea of immersion much more than with that of sprinkling." * * * "In the oriental church this practice (immersion) has been preserved without change down to the present day; and the completeness of baptism is made to depend absolutely on its being performed by immersion, and not by any less universal application of water." *Review of Baptist Noel on Baptism. Mercersburg Review for May* 1850.

Dr. Schaff, Prof. of Theology, of the same church, in his Church History published some fifteen years since, in this country, in German, and since translated into English, on page 488 (German edition) says;

"As to the mode of the external act of baptism, *it is beyond all doubt that immersion and not aspersion was the original and normal form.*—This is clear, first, from the meaning of the Greek words *baptizo, baptisma*, and *baptismos*, by which this rite is designated. Secondly, from the analogy of the baptism of John, who performed the act *in* Jordan. ("*En*," Matt. 3, 6. comp. 16, also "*Eis ton Jordanen*," Mk. 1. 9.) Thirdly from the cases in the N. Testament, where baptism is compared to the passage through the Red Sea, 1 Cor. 10. 2;—to the flood, 1 Pet. 3. 16;—to a bath, Eph. 5. 26;—Tit. 3. 12;—to a burial and a resurrection, Rom. 6. 4. Col. 2 13;—and finally it is proved *from the universal custom of the ancient church, that always baptized by immersion*, (as the oriental and Græco-Russian churches do to this day), and admitted of affusion or aspersion only in extreme cases of the sick and the dying."

On the meaning of the Greek words, *baptizo* &c., our author subjoins the following note.

"*Baptizo*, (*eis ti, en tini*, also *pros ti*) is the frequentative form of *bapto*, but differs not from it in meaning, except that the latter, in a *secondary* sense, also means to dye. Baptizo, in the classics, always implies an entire or partial immersion, [That is, you may say that his whole body is immersed, or that his head, hand, or foot &c., is immersed.—C. L. L.) *and not every mode of applying water*, such as aspersion and affusion, without any reference to the quantity of water used, as many narrow minded opponents of Baptists, as Doct. Dick, in his Theology B. 88, have, by all manner of exegetical subtilties, and by

a violent forcing of texts, attempted to prove. To see the truth of our declaration, let any one examine the lexicons, and especially Dr. Alex. Carson's conclusive exhibition of this philological argument, in his work, entitled "Baptism in its mode and subject," p. 18—168. It is true that Dr. Robinson in the last edition of his Greek and English lexicon, p. 118, maintains that the word in later Hellenistic usage appears to express the general idea of washing or aspersion, and appeals for this to Luke 11. 38. (Compare Mk. 7. 2–4.) and Mark 7. 4–8 (to which may be added Heb. 8. 10.) and to the improbability of baptizing by immersion 3000 on the day of Pentecost, and subsequently 5000, at Jerusalem, since in the vicinity of the city, in the summer, there is no considerable water, but the fountain and stream of Siloam, and the houses were supplied with water from the cisterns and reservoirs. To this it might be answered, that the immersion might have been performed in any large reservoir or bath-house, and it is nowhere said, that they were all baptized at the same time and at the same spot. We can yet suppose a middle way between a total immersion of the whole body and a mere sprinkling, that is, the immersion or entire affusion of the whole head, and for that there was always water enough in Jerusalem. So that, even admitting that sometimes *baptizein* may mean merely to sprinkle, (or more properly, to wash), it must ever be regarded as a most uncommon exception to the rule, and according to all the cases known to me, occurs only where the object—the hands or the vessel—are entirely covered with water by affusion; so that in the end, it still amounts to an immersion, as the object of washing and of ablutions is the entire wetting of the object."

While Prof. Schaff will not give up to Baptists the question of the *subject* of Baptism, he nevertheless says farther "On the mode of Baptism, therefore, *the impartial historian must admit that the Baptists are right*, as almost all German historians have done; as Neander, Knapp, Hoefling, &c. It is well known that the reformers Luther and Calvin, and several of the old Protestant church formularies, gave preference to immersion, which, doubtless, is much better calculated than aspersion, figuratively to represent the idea of baptism, that is, the entire purification of the inner man."

With this we conclude. The value of these testimonies,—which might be multiplied, lies in the fact that they all come from pedobaptists, who had no motives, but the sheer unavoidable force of truth, to make these admissions, as all their prejudices would naturally be on the opposite side. What, then, shall we say of the unpardonable ignorance, or the blinding prejudice of men claiming to be lights, who will declare that immersion is not a valid form of baptism, and who claim this only for aspersion or affusion? On such men all light and argument is lost. Alas, for these unhappy victims of sect education, sect passion and sect slavery! C. L. L.

The ear that heareth the reproof of life abideth among the wise.

THE MISSOURI OATH: A. PROCTOR, *ET AL.*

Bro. Pendleton:—In the October Harbinger, appears an article from the pen of A. Proctor, followed by remarks from your own pen. By your permission, I will offer a few suggestions by way of review or reply: Bro. Proctor proposes three questions, as follows: "Shall we take this oath and preach?," "Shall we disregard it and preach?" "Shall we abandon the preaching of the gospel in Missouri altogether?"

1. He assumes that the rights to worship and to preach, are conferred by no civil government, but are direct gifts of God: that "God grants rights to men, not because they are citizens of any civil government, but simply because they are men, the first of which in the order of time and chief in importance, is religious freedom." Now will Bro. Proctor be kind enough to tell us upon what *conditions* God has given this religious freedom to men, which he holds "chief in importance," and "more precious than life itself"? Perhaps he will be surprised at such a question; yet the time was not far in the past, when a large portion of the citizens of this country held, that that "religious freedom" was conditioned upon the color of a man's skin, or upon his social position. It ran about thus: The white man has all the "religious freedom" God gives him; the negro has all the "religious freedom" the white man gives him. The *civil law* too, this very thing producing so much stir among our conscientious brethren in Missouri, was brought in with all its terrors, to *enforce* that same "religious freedom" among the blacks. It is childish to say they were permitted to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, while it is a well known fact that they held their meetings under surveillance; and if they broke away from this restraint—refused to take the "test oath"—and held meetings according to their own "dictates," they were at once accused of insurrection, and often punished in the most summary and terrible manner.—It is true that many men flippant at special pleading, have attempted to set this aside, by taking cases in the border States, where negroes were neither numerous nor valuable, and by drawing general conclusions from special premises, have endeavored to prove the negro in possession of the fullest religious freedom, and in general, the happiest man one ever saw. But the fallacy would not work, and stubborn facts soon dispelled the charm. It may be considered late in the day, however, to discuss such a question; yet the loud demands made by Bro. Proctor and others for "religious freedom," can but remind us of man's self-complacency while trouble is afar off, or while it

rests upon the limbs and flesh and hearts of the poor and the despised. "But now it is come upon thee, and thou faintest; it toucheth thee, and thou art troubled."

2. "Towards my race." Under this head, the reasoning is so utterly fallacious, and the facts cited, so entirely inapplicable to the case in hand, that one can scarcely think it comes from the pen of Bro. Proctor. What were the "test oaths" of which he speaks, "only a few centuries past"? Were they oaths simply for the protection of the government itself? or were they oaths prescribing forms of worship, articles of faith, and even texts for preaching? Does the Missouri oath compel Bro. Proctor to be a Christian or Catholic, a Baptist or Methodist? Does it require him to accept this religious creed or that? Verily none of these. Where then is the trouble?—Evidently and simply in past hostility to, or treason against, the government seeking to protect itself, by putting to silence, or practically banishing from its limits, the very class of men most active and conspicuous in plunging it into the horrors of the late terrible civil war. Upon this principle, men who really, according to the New Testament, have a right to preach, find no difficulty in taking the oath, as witness our venerable and beloved brother, T. M. Allen.

3. "Towards my country." Bro. Proctor reads the history of the "American Revolution" from books which have never happened this way. The books in this direction assure us that the "American Revolution" was gotten up upon the alleged outrage of "taxation without representation"—a mere occasion, the desire for independent power being the cause, just as in the late rebellion, slavery was made the occasion, while that same love of power and independence was the cause. Farther to assume that the American Revolution was either occasioned or caused by that desire for religious freedom, is strange logic, in the light of the fact first, that that freedom, with a single exception, already obtained before the breaking out of the "Revolution"; and in the light of the fact second, that the greatest of American Infidels were among the chief actors in the whole drama. It is true they inserted religious freedom in the great Charter, but a sound common sense would suggest this, if nothing else; but in addition, it has often been hinted that this was done at the suggestion of Thomas Jefferson, quite as much to give full scope to infidelity, as to "religious freedom." Besides, the American Revolution was a Rebellion; and a Christian had no more right to engage in the rebellion of '76, than in the rebellion of '61, to gain his religious freedom, or any other freedom. Bro. Proctor has already argued, that "religious freedom" is a gift not from *any* civil government, but a gift from God. It is strange logic now, therefore, to place Christians in the van of the

great rebellion of '76, politely called "Revolution," in order to secure their religious freedom.

4. Bro. Proctor now speaks of the penalties inflicted upon those who do not take the oath, but does not tell us what the oath is, from which many have formed very false conceptions of the facts in the case. Section 3, of Article III, of the New Constitution, is probably too long to be inserted in this connection; but it may be briefly comprehended in these words: it requires a man to make oath, that during the late war he was not a rebel; not a "bushwhacker"; not a guerilla; not a so-called Confederate soldier; and that he did not by sympathy, word or deed, give aid to the rebellion as opposed to the government of the United States, or the State of Missouri. The case therefore is simply this: the man who was true to his country, is not prevented from preaching by that oath; if not true to his country, he did not "render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," thus violating the divine law as well as the civil, and proving himself, to say the least, a very incompetent minister of "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." But suppose it be urged that even such men may repent of their sins, and return and wish to preach? or suppose it is claimed that in *intention* they did not sin, but were misled? yet they did the things which bring them within the compass of Section 3. What then? Simply, in the language which Bro. Proctor calls "unutterable heartlessness"—"Let them go." Bro. Proctor may think this very heartless; he may appeal to his "thirty years" in the State; to the graves of his fathers, and a thousand holy memories, yet as good men as Bro. Proctor have broken away from all those things, or have been driven away by means a thousand fold severer than this "test oath"—driven away too with the loss of all their worldly goods,—and are now thousands of miles from their native homes, preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ. In the light of this question, there are but two classes of preachers in Missouri: those who aided the rebellion, and those who did not. The former cannot in truth take this oath; "let them go," if fit to preach at all, where it is most required; plenty of good and loyal men will fill their places: the latter can take this oath, as Bro. Allen has done, and that should be an end of the whole matter. Bro. Proctor affirms most positively his own loyalty; this I am rejoiced to hear, as I have nothing but the most holy memories of "the days we've spent together"; but I can see little difference between making this affirmation of loyalty in the pages of the Harbinger, and before a Missouri Justice of the Peace, the latter being all that is requisite to enable him to proceed with the duties of his office as heretofore.

One more item is worthy of Bro. Proctor's notice—a false use of

terms: this has had much to do in all these troubles. It has been taught, specially in the South, in utter and apparently wanton disregard of plain Scripture precepts, that while rebellion is a crime against God and man, "Revolution" is a right belonging even to Christians; and Bro. Proctor by implication still inculcates this doctrine, by speaking of the late war as the "accident of revolution," whereas a more premeditated, uncalled-for, malicious *rebellion*, was probably never made.

THE "REMARKS."

Under this head the general scope of the reasoning does not need any reply or review. But a few positions radically wrong in substance and dangerous in tendency, must not pass unnoticed; the first in order and "chief in importance" being, not that A. Proctor should "resist"* the civil power, but that W. K. Pendleton should approve his decision. This, among the friends of the latter, has produced the most profound astonishment and regret. By what arguments Bro. Pendleton attempts to sustain his position, it is not now necessary to consider, as they are substantially the same as those used by Bro. Proctor. It is however singular to observe, that all these proceed upon the hypothesis, that this "oath law is a direct interference with religious liberty and the rights of conscience." They seem to forget that the oath says not one single word about the right to *worship*.—There is not a man in Missouri this day, that may not *worship* as freely as ever he could in his life, and as publicly; but he may not act as an *officer*. Do none *worship* God except officers? Where there is real "collision," "it is better to obey God rather than man." But is there any collision in Missouri between the civil and divine laws?—Only upon possible contingencies, and those entirely of a political character, for political safety, and limited by the boundaries of a single State. The real question of collision, as seen in the ages past, is where the civil law assumes to command men not to preach Christ at all, and this is only done in pagan countries where there are "other gods," or where it commands them to preach particular doctrines about Christ. In either case, man should die rather than obey. But where any parallel between such facts and the present condition in Missouri, can be found, by which "an infidel power, true to its old

* It will be observed that while Bro. Proctor proposes *three* questions, he does not really answer any one of them: he proceeds to show why he cannot take the oath in question, but does not tell whether he will continue to preach, and incur the penalties of the law. The inference is however clear, that both he and Bro. Pendleton advise the full scope of the second question, viz.—"disregard the oath and preach": hence the language above—"resist the civil powers."

instincts, is greedy to strike its poisonous fangs into the vitals of religious liberty," is past my comprehension. Still further to illustrate the question of collision, a case is supposed; suppose a man to become a Christian—then a preacher—having previously been engaged in the rebellion. The law of Christ says, preach; the law of Missouri says, take the oath first. This is Bro. Pendleton's supposition, and he makes it a "collision" between the divine and human laws, and counsels of course to "obey God rather than man." In the first place however, the supposition is not a fair one; for it is not supposable that the law of the "test oath" is to be made applicable to any except those *at present* holding the offices enumerated; it is upon those who sinned as religious officials, by using their official position to injure the State, that these penalties fall: and in the second place, if such were the fact; the answer still comes—"let them go" to other fields, where neither the memory of sins past, nor oaths for time to come, would interfere with their principles or duties.

But let us suppose another case: suppose any State, or civil power, finds its own life threatened, and its very existence endangered;—has it a right to protect itself? but suppose the life of this State is threatened by a large and powerful class of men, called "preachers, elders and deacons;"—has the State a right to protect itself agianst them? but further suppose that these "preachers elders and deacons," claimed to be exercising their legitimate functions as such officers, and yet their course of conduct threatened the life of the State;—would the State still have a right to protect itself? Now this we think comprehends the case fairly: if in the above supposition, the legitimate preaching of the Gospel would overturn a civil power and break it into countless fragments, let it go—preach the gospel; but how is it when these same "preachers elders and deacons" turn aside from the Gospel to preach the "divine right of slavery"; to preach that "Resistance to tyrants is duty to God; to preach that one part of their *own* country should secede from, and rebel against another part; to trample upon its *own* flag, and defy its own laws? Has not a State a right to defend itself against any and all such men? And if they come under the garb of religion to preach such things, the greater the crime, and the more terrible should be the penalty; and it is folly to assert that among all the classes of the South, any were more active in bringing about the war, than the entire list of preachers, of all sects. Indeed, it would not be difficult to show that secession practically began in the so called church; for would-be-theologians had given the example of "Church North" and "Church South," long before politicians attempted a separation of the States.

It is well said in the article under consideration, that "Resistance

to tyrants is duty to God," "is true only for the men of this world," if indeed it can be said that "the men of this world" acknowledge any "duty to God;" for it is a clear scriptural principle as any in the Bible, that *Christians* must "suffer" but not "resist;" and damnation is threatened upon those that *do* resist. It is upon such principles that it has been affirmed in another part of this paper, that the "American Revolution" was simply a Rebellion; and our forefathers whom we venerate, were as truly rebels in the eye of the British Government, as any man in the South ever was a rebel in the eye of the United States Government. And Christians of that day who were called "tories," and whose memories are now execrated, were really the men who remained true to their own Government. But there are men among us *who did resist*: they resisted even unto blood; one of our hitherto most prominent preachers, and still prominent where he is, wrote to a friend thus: "We must separate; peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must." Another prominent one said thus: "We are going North; and if the yankees do not submit, we will come back with their ears to our saddle bows." Hundreds of others have also "resisted," some in a great, some in a less degree—yet have resisted. Now the Scriptures say that "such shall receive damnation." Will bro. Pendleton tell us whence comes this damnation? for these same preachers come among us now—congratulate themselves on the bravery of the South—say they are "only whipped, not conquered"—ask the full fellowship of the church and their former associate preachers—ask immunity from the penalties of the civil law—demand that they shall not even take an "oath of loyalty" to their Government, and great men with amazing haste rush to their defense! Whence then cometh the damnation we are anxious to know? Not of us, for we give them the hand of fellowship; not from the State, for we hasten to exempt them from her oaths; and crtainly not from God, for we should be unwilling to think we are associating and laboring in the Gospel with a class of men that God holds under condemnation!

Let us suppose another case: one of our proud declarations to the world is, that we take the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible for our rule of faith and practice; suppose now at the breaking out of the rebellion, our brethren all over the South had remained true to their government instead of joining against it; would they have attracted no attention? would not the eyes of the whole world have been upon them? And when inquiry should be made, who are these people—why are they the only ones who remain true to their country—what is their creed? then would come the simple but sublime answer: The Bible is their creed, and that teaches them obedi-

ence to the lawful powers. This would have given us a power over the world that now we shall never gain; we are now simply a sect among sects, having no stronger bond of union where personal interests or worldly questions arise, than the most insignificant sect in the land; then we might have shown ourselves *the* people of God. It was a great occasion, and such an one as God gives to a people but once in centuries. But alas, when it came, we proved ourselves false to our plea for "the *whole Bible* and proved ourselves not the men for the hour. Even here in the peaceful north, churches have been rent asunder, and preachers in places dismissed because they would preach from such texts as Rom. 13: 1–2; 1 Peter 2: 12–14, and Titus 3: 1. And to have preached from such texts in the South, applying them to the United States, would have been death!

O what a shame! what recreants to a a self-imposed and most sacred and holy trust—the whole Bible for a dying world! It is heart-rending enough "to stir a fever in the blood of age," to see the full, rich golden moment for great and glorious deeds, placed once within our reach, then forevor lost! Perhaps, however, we should be neither pained nor surprised at these things, when we remember that *love of country* in the South has been held subservient to *love of slavery*; when prominent preachers of our own have declared that they would rather see the United states Government destroyed, "than to see the niggers all turned loose among us"; and when they have withdrawn from our Missionary Societies and attempted to destroy them because they offered "Resolutions *" of sympathy for the brave men who loved their country well enough to fight for, and if need be, give up their lives in its defense. Perhaps we should be surprised at none of these things; yet really one can hardly help thinking they are wondrous things, and in the light of the Scriptures, scarcely susceptible of explanation.

There are a few special points to note in conclusion.

1. It is held that a Christian "may advocate and vote for his political theories"; but when it comes to war, he must stand aloof; he is then "not of this world." But suppose that "advocacy" of, and "voting" for his "political theories," bring on a war or "revolution," what then? mark, now, the *advocacy* of, and *voting* for "political theories," are conceded to the Christian. Yet that advocacy *and* voting did bring about our late war. Had there been no secession, there could have been no war. Those therefore, who advocated and

* I have observed that the late Missionary Meeting in Ky. passed "Resolutions" of sympathy for these Missouri brethren; it is to be hoped that the "Constitution" of the Kentucky Society ALLOWS such "Resolutions," otherwise certain valiant knights of the quill should write down the Ky. Society as they did (?) the A. C. M. Society.

voted for the act of secession must forever be held responsible for one of the most gigantic rebellions known to the history of the world. It is to say the least, peculiar doctrine, to affirm that a Christian has a right to participate in all the proceedings that lead to strife, then step aside and coolly say: You must fight this out now gentlemen; we can act on *neither* side; "our weapons are not carnal but spiritual."

2. Great effort is made to show that a Christian must stand entirely aloof from *both* sides, as if there were no difference between "going to war" at the bid of usurped authorities, to fight in rebellion *against* the Government, and "going to war" at the command of the regularly constituted "powers that be," to fight *for* the Government. Yet it has been boldly asserted by some of these preachers in question, that during the whole war, the rebel and union soldiers and officers stood upon precisely the same moral footing. It is doubtless a waste of time to argue with such men, and we can only pray for their speedy conversion from the errors of their ways.

3. It is further maintained that the support of a Government by the sword, belongs "to the men of the world;" that the "church is apart from the world;" but that it "may be often difficult for a Christian to decide which of two contending powers is the one that is entitled to his obedience." The first and second of these statements may be true in a given sense, but surely not in the one already defined, wherein it is claimed that a Christian "may advocate and vote for his political theories." The right to enjoy the benefits of a Government, nay, to assist in making it, certainly involves some duties in its maintenance and defense. This is a main feature, almost always overlooked in searching the Scriptures on these questions; for the apostles lived under governments which neither they nor the people had any voice in making; but we live under a Government which we ourselves have made. There can be therefore but one possible position for the strictly "non-resistant": he must neither "advocate" nor "vote": he must not sue at law, nor in any wise call on Cæsar to assist him: if his property be stolen, he must not ask Cæsar to punish the thief or restore his property: if his wife be murdered, he must not ask leave to execute vengeance, for "vengeance is mine, I will repay saith the Lord." In short, he must simply pay his taxes, "obey the magistrates," and have no further connection with an earthly Government. If such should be the ground assumed by the "non-resistant," I should not be prepared to dispute him. But never let it once be hinted that in fighting *for* or *against* one's own Government, the "resistance" is upon the same footing. The third statement above, concerning the difficulty to "decide between two

contending powers," may be true in some cases of the past; but if meant to be applied to the late war, I have simply to say, I have no bounds to my surprise at the source from whence it comes.

The war has passed away, but not all its bitterness; and it has become a serious question with many of our best men, as to the course to be pursued now towards our brethren known to have been committed to the rebellion. Dr. Hopson proposes to solve the difficulty by keeping up the "line" North and South, and having each man stay on his own side of the "line." But this would be practically a division of the church—as fatal to its interests as the "dead line" in Andersonville to the the poor union soldiers—and an event to be deplored in sackcloth and ashes. Individually I have not yet been able to contemplate division even as a remote contingency. Slavery did not divide us before the war: both slavery and the war failed to divide us; and surely now that both are gone, we ought to declare that their results shall not divide us. Such have been my feelings. I have made advances toward fellowship, scarcely expected from one called so "radical"—advances which have surprised, and in some instances offended, my most intimate friends. I am profoundly anxious to co-operate with, and call brother and sister, every man, woman and child permitted to wear the name Christian; and I will exhaust all the resources scripturally within my power, before I will yield these yearnings of my heart; at the same time I hold myself free, if resistance to civil law among my preaching brethren is to be one of the first fruits of the blood and carnage of the four years war, to reconsider my positions, and adjust them to what now appears either a new phase to the question, or a revival of the old antagonisms under a new form.

O. A. Burgess.

REPLY.

We publish the foregoing article from the pen of Bro. Burgess with some reluctance; not because of its argument, for that we most cordially welcome, as desirable inquiry upon a great and fundamental interest of the church; but because of its frequent and irrelevant allusion to a most painful political strife, which is now over, we trust, and which needs so much the gentle and loving Spirit of Christianity to soothe and allay the yet lingering turbulence of its recently stormy waters. To these things we make no reply, because they are foreign to the discussion in hand, and out of the area which we have prescribed to ourselves in publishing a strictly religious journal. Doubtless a politician of opposite political sentiments to those which betray themselves in Bro. Burgess's article, could find some reply to them

that would satisfy at least his political friends; but I do not suppose that the discussion would tend in the least either to the edification of the church or the cultivation of brotherly love between the parties. They are questions of the gloomy past, from which we gladly turn as best we can. As an *argumentum ad hominem*, they can at most only illustrate the general law of human frailty; they prove nothing as to the question we are arguing. Suppose it could be made out that Bro. Proctor, or any one else, has not been as zealous in psst years in vindicating the paramount duty of Christians to preach the gospel as he should have been, what does this prove against his zeal now? Because men have neglected a duty in the past, must they neglect it forever! If they have not freely felt and realized the importance of a duty when it related to others, must they therefore refuse to recognize it when it is brought home to themselves! Does not our Heavenly Father often adopt this method of discipline to lead us to reformation? He makes the case our own, for the very purpose of constraining us to look more narrowly into our duty to him. But admitting all that Bro. Burgess says about the restraints imposed upon the religious freedom of the negro, does he not see that if it was wrong in the case of the negro, it is also wrong in the case of the white man? If it was wrong for any State to say to a negro, called by his church to preach the gospel, "You shall not preach," it surely can not be any less so, when the prohibition is directed against a white man!

But the great question of concern with me is this: Should the church admit by its concurrence, that any government or human power may prescribe the conditions on which her ministers may "preach" and "teach"? This is what the State of Missouri has undertaken to do, and this is the question I am discussing. I take the negative. I do not advise "resistance," in the sense in which many take that word—but I counsel *to preach, and, if need be, suffer.* This is my position. That this position should produce among my "friends the most profound astonishment and regret," is to me, I confess, profoundly and regretfully astonishing. But of course Bro. Burgess means *some* of my friends only. Doubtless there are *some* who do not sympathize in this astonishment. But in this case, while I greatly respect the judgment of friends, I have consulted no one but my Bible and my conscience. No one advised me what to write, no one asked me to write at all. My "Remarks" are a free will offering, and if I cannot sustain my position, let the better informed show me my error, in the spirit of love. On the contrary, let me be heard with candor, and without prejudice. It seems that even Bro. Burgess has, in the generous exercise of his nobler Christian nature, not only "surprised, but

in some instances offended his most intimate friends." From him, at least, therefore, I expect a fellow feeling while I rest under this cloud of "profound astonishment." For the present, however, I am constrained, no matter how reluctantly, to consider him as doing his best to overshadow and overwhelm me with it. We shall see.

In contending as we do, that this Missouri oath interferes with the free discharge of a divine commandment, viz., that to "preach" and to "teach," Bro. Burgess says we seem to forget that "the oath says not a single word about the right to *worship;* but only that he may not act as an *officer*." And then he very triumphantly asks, "Do none *worship* God except officers?" This is astonishing for a man of Bro. Burgess's training. What is the argument? Why simply this: So long as the State leaves unprohibited a part of the divine commandments, it may do what it pleases with the rest, and Christians must obey! The Savior commands us to Preach, and to Teach, and to Worship. The State interferes and says, "You shall not worship unless you take this oath." Bro. Burgess says here is collision; it is better to obey God rather than man—I cannot conform. The State relents and says, "Well, you may worship, but you shall not preach nor teach in this name." All right, says Bro. Burgess that is the business of the officers of the church, and though they are appointed by divine authority, and the same authority which commands us to worship commands us also to preach and teach, yet there are "contingencies entirely of a political character, for political safety, and limited by the boundaries of a single State," and it is all right. If they will not take your conditions, depose them practically from their office and forbid them to obey the command of their Savior to preach and to teach. James says, Whosoever keeps the whole law and yet offends in one point, he is guilty of all (2: 10.); but this doctrine reverses the divine principle, and says, "Whosoever keeps one commandment and offends in all the rest, is innocent as to all."

But we take pleasure in noting that Bro. Burgess and myself do not differ at all in the principle involved in the case. It seems that he is not pleased, however, with the application of it to the Missouri oath; and as we wish not to darken counsel with unnecessary words, we will address ourselves at once to this, the true point in discussion. It seems that the case which I suppose in illustration, is objected to upon the ground that the "test oath" is not to be applied to any except those at *present* holding office. But this explanation does not affect the illustration, for all that I suppose, is supposed to have happened before the time designated for the application of the oath. Besides, this oath involves a general principle, and the right or wrong of such is not a question of chronology. If the State has a right to

prescribe a rule by which alone the present ministers of the gospel may preach and teach, they have a right to prescribe the same rule for those appointed to-morrow. Besides, is it true that ministers who have been ordained since this oath first became binding, are exempt from its conditions? I opine not. Certainly it is not so stated in the law. My supposition then *is fair*, and the explanation of Bro. Burgess is not.

But how is it with Bro. Burgess's supposition? He supposes the case of a State or a civil power having its life threatened and its very existence endangered, and asks, "Has it a right to protect itself?" To make the case still more pointed, he supposes that "the life of this State is threatened by a large and powerful class of men, called preachers, elders and deacons; Has the State a right to protect itself against them?" Now I need not tell Bro. Burgess, for he is too good a historian not to know, that this was precisely the pretext of the most bloody persecutions ever perpetrated by the Roman Emperors. I need only to remind him of the 97th Epistle of the younger Pliny, and the imperial reply to it, to place this question beyond cavil. The Proprætor writes, *Multi enim omnis ætatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus*, "many of every age and rank, and of both sexes," had not only become indifferent to the religion of the State, but were ready to denounce it as false, and that they had adopted another. "The temples were forsaken, the simulacra of the gods and of the emperor were defrauded of the customary homage; and, besides, stated assemblies of the people were having place for purpose unknown, and therefore unlawful, and not to be tolerated." See the venerable Polycarp, hunted by the rabble of Smyrna, surrendering himself with dignity to the officers of the Proconsul! The mild Quadratus, Proconsul of Asia, was neither sanguinary nor fanatical, but pressed by the fanaticism of the populace and his own sense of public justice, he drags this martyr-spirit to the tribunal, upon the very charge that he had violated the public order *forbidding him to preach*. It seems that the obduracy of the spirit of the law was tempered by respect for the Christian nobility of the victim, and these stern exactors of the letter, yet sought to shield him from the popular fury by persuading him to express an outward conformity to the legal requirement. "Why not invoke the Emperor and offer sacrifice? What harm can there be in uttering the words Κυριε Καισαρ, and then to sacrifice, and thus save yourself?" The harm was in this, that it would be understood to mean that he rendered to Cæsar what his conscience told him was due only to God, and he would not do it. He could not consent to hold the exercise of his duty to preach, subject to any conditions imposed by Cæsar, and though he might comply with them *in form*,

with the privilege of any mental reservation he might choose to make, yet his conscience would not let him accept the favor, since it involved a reflection upon Him whom it was the very glory of his mission to confess before men, as alone his Savior and King.

But there is nothing in all this that Bro. Burgess does not approve and advise, because it was the *legitimate* preaching of the gospel.—He feels, evidently, that after all, it is not against "preaching and teaching," in the scriptural use of these words (and it is only in this sense that they can be taken in this discussion), that the State has any divine right to legislate, but against *illegitimate* preaching and teaching. Now we take it that Bro. Burgess is too astute a logician not to see that here slips in the sophistry of his whole objection to my argument. The words *preach* and *teach*, in the sense of this law, must be taken in their scriptural meaning. In this sense alone and strictly, I take them and argue from them. It forbids a minister, not a politician, who has not taken this oath, to preach, not to speak on politics. Suppose one of these inhibited preachers were to turn out an avowed political stump-speaker, and befoul himself with vulgar party harangues, does Bro. Burgess, or any one else, suppose that this law would be applied to hinder him? Certainly not. It is precisely legitimate preaching that is meant. I perfectly agree with Bro. Burgess, that if the Christian minister turns aside from what he calls legitimate preaching, and gives himself to efforts to subvert the government, he becomes justly the subject of punishment for so flagrant a violation of law. I have nothing to say against the action of human law, within its legitimate sphere. It is when it transcends this sphere and impinges upon the divine rights and obligations of the Christian church, that I demur. If the government says to me as a Christian man, "You shall not speak in public on politics," I obey; if it says, "You shall not vote," I obey; if it says, "You shall not own the house you live in," I submit. If it takes me by its civil officers and sends me a prisoner to Rome, I go without resistance.—But if it says to me, You shall not *preach* or *teach*, then I remember Paul and his chains, and the power that made Felix tremble, even while he sat to judge him, and say, I cannot obey—"Necessity is laid upon me, yea woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel" (1 Cor. 9: 16). Will Bro. Burgess go any farther in obedience to human law than this? May I not ask him without offense, will he go so far!

It is not a question with us in this discussion how "*secession practically began.*" If, as Bro. Burgess says, by preaching, then it was evidently his "illegitimate preaching," and this the State is welcome to look to and punish as much as she pleases or may think necessary for her preservation; but in punishing an offense against the State,

do not let her strike a blow at the church; in exercising her right of self-defense, do not let her deny the same right to the superior life of Christianity; in bringing to justice "illegitimate preaching," be careful that she employs nothing but legitimate means; and in suppressing political offenses, see that she does not smother the voice of the gospel.

I leave the defense of our revolutionary fathers to those who venerate patriotism more than they do Christianity, but I cannot pass without a word in answer to Bro. Burgess's difficulty as to "whence cometh the damnation that is threatened in the Scriptures against those who resist" &c. "Not of us," he says, "not of the State, and certainly not of God." Certainly, the apostle means to teach that the *State* will punish such. The language is *declarative* not *mandatory*, for Christianity does not prescribe the special laws of civil governments. If the civil government chooses to punish she may do so, and if she chooses not to punish she may do so. But the point I make is this: Whether the State shall choose or not to inflict the "damnation," which it is her prerogative to impose, she must not, in selecting her means of doing it, interfere with the authority of Christ. Cannot a State punish these persons by some other penalty, than one which forbids Christian ministers to preach and teach? Surely she can. If a minister violates the civil law, as a citizen, punish him, as you would any one else for the same offense, but do not undertake through the authority of the State to impose, what is strictly an ecclesiastical punishment. Let me express the argument briefly thus:—

The State has no right to impose ecclesiastic punishments;
Forbidding to preach and teach is an ecclesitstic punishment;
Therefore the State has no right to forbid to preach and teach.

To this position I am sure Bro. Burgess must yield his hearty consent, for I know that he is not prepared to advocate the union of Church and State, or the transfer of Church Government to the civil tribunals of Missouri or any other State.

We pass by the recital of various waifs of gossip, as to what certain unnamed preachers may have said. We could fill pages with such extravagances of passion from men all around us, if they were worthy of record. I regret to print such things no matter who speaks them, and cannot but feel that brother Burgess has taken undue advantage of his privilege of a respondent to interlard so much political rhetoric altogether foreign to this discussion, and tending only to excite and still further embitter prejudices and controversies, which it ought to be our earnest aim to calm and soothe by the moderation and courtesy that ever belong to even a formal reconciliation. After the termination of the long strife between the Cavaliers and the Round-

heads, it is said that both parties manifested the most scrupulous respect for each other, and that they avoided, in their intercourse, as far as possible, all allusion to the questions of their long and bloody strife. If compelled to allude to them at all, they used no odious epithets on either side, full as the language had become of such, but spoke of things only under the general form of "Our troubles." This was kind humane, and in the victors, most generous and noble. Why is the "nigger" lugged into this discussion? Why is the action of the Ky. Missionary Society referred to in this connection? What if our Southern brethren did not take the stand that Bro. Burgess contemplates with such a glow of feeling? Does any of these things affect the question, as to the duty of Christians to conform to the requirements of the Missouri oath?

The questions which are touched upon in the conclusion of Bro. Burgess's "review" are too comprehensive to allow of full discussion in the close of this reply. It is something new, that a man may not discuss and vote for his political views and theories, without being thereby obligated to fight for them! I have not so read the Scriptures. Things allowed by the State and perfectly lawful it seems to me may be enjoyed by the Christian, without his becoming thereby bound to do things which are forbidden by the law of Christ. Paul appealed to Cæsar, but we never hear of his volunteering as a captain or a soldier of his legions. Bro Burgess says "Had there been no voting for secession, there would have been no war." The assertion of truisms is not argument. Is it not equally true, that if there had been no voting against secession there would have been no war. And what is proved by either assertion. But for further information on this and other kindred questisns we refer Bro. Burgess and the curious to the "Bills of Rights," and the "Constitutions" of all the States, especially the old Original Thirteen. It has been a long time since I gave much attention to these matters, and I trust it will be still longer before I give much more: the curious, therefore, must excuse me if I do no more than to simply refer them to these apostolic days and documents of our body politic.

Many of our preachers in Missouri, who have declined to take this oath, are still preaching and teaching, and they have not been molested. I need not name many known to me. The civil authorities themselves in most cases regard the law as unworthy of a Christian land and do not trouble themselves to enforce it. Some of our Preachers have taken it. Our venerable and beloved Bro. T. M. Allen who is the soul of honor and worthy of highest imitation in all that adorns the Christian minister has taken it, but brother Burgess has seen his *explanation*, and I need only remind him, that he took this oath to

maintain his civil position as Trustee of the State University, and of Columbia College, not to give him authority to preach the gospel.—This he expressly says, he does by the same authority, as he ever did. These offices are of the State's creation and of course it is right to recognize her authority over them—if we continue to hold them.

I turn with grateful feelings to the closing paragraph of brother Burgess's review. His Christian instincts are better than his political dialectics. The Christian rises above the party and the sectional pleader, and like the wine at the marriage of Cana in Gallilee, we we have his best last. Let him maintain this practical wisdom of the Holy Spirit, and struggle on with us in the truly sublime work of maintaining "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." There is not, and there will not be, the least necessity for his revewing his decision. Nobody counsels "*resistance* to civil law among our preaching brethren,"—and if any of them think it to be their duty to "preach and teach" and quietly and peacebly suffer fine and imprisonment for it, why let him, if he should pity their discretion, still admire their loyalty to Christ, and forgive them for "conscience sake," their conscience, not his, and in the King's name keep the peace about it forever. W. K. P.

SPIRITUAL DECLENSION,—No. I.

There are numerous indications of a decadence in the most vigorous and popular denominations in our land. Amidst many tokens of increased wealth, and material grandeur, such as the erection of more splendid edifices, an increased pompousness of worship, and enlarged enterprise in all that depends on benevolent contributions—we are ever and anon startled by unmistakable evidences of internal decay. For instance, the Lutheran Almanac for 1865, gives us, in that denomination, 1,543 ministers; 2,765 congregations; and 292,723 communicants. The Almanac for 1866, gives 1,523 minister; 2,632 congregations; and 286,273 communicants: or a decrease, in one year, of 20 ministers, 133 congregations, and 6,450 communicants. The last census of the Methodist Episcopal church, also showed a decrease in numerical strength. The Baptists in New York also exhibit signs of decay, as well as the Congregationalists in the New England States. It is generally sought to account for the falling off in numbers in the Eastern States, from the great emigration to the West; and where local or sectional causes fail to account for the failure—as in the full statistics of the Lutherans and Methodists—the most ready explanation is found in the excitements and desolations of four years war. We are slow to believe, however, that an adequate reason is to

be found in the unfavorable effects of a four years' war. Comparatively little destruction or suffering was known among the people of the North during the war. The losses chiefly sustained were in bereavements—a kind of loss which ought to have been made to contribute to an increase of religiousness. The social influence of such a membership as that of the Methodist Episcopal and Lutheran churches, must be reckoned as a great power. The two churches, we presume, exceed three quarters of a million of members. Without any very special *pulpit* effort, the home and social influence of that number of sincere religionists, should result in a very large increase to the churches. If their families and Sunday Schools, and ministry cannot supply the losses occasioned by the war, then surely "many are weak and sickly among them, and many sleep." The vital power is not great that succumbs to such a pressure, or that can be effectivly drained by a few years of unusual worldly excitement. No: the causes lie deeper than this. It has been ascertained and published, that in the city of Cincinnati, *there are fewer communicants in the evangelical churches than there were twenty years ago*, although, in that time, the population of the city has been quadrupled! This startling fact has aroused the evangelicals of that goodly city; and public meetings are, at this present writing, being held for the consideration of the disease and the remedy. We presume that, as usual, doctors will differ both as to disease and remedy. But in one thing we think it likely they will agree:—that no *local* cause can be assigned for this alarming state of things. If the statistics of other cities were as carefully gathered, we presume that a similar set of facts would be presented,—at least through all those portions of our country where there has been no large increase from immigration.—The same alarming indications are witnessed in England and Scotland,—as we noticed in the May number of the present volume of the Harbinger, in commenting on an address by Dr. McCosh. More than twenty years ago, a similar consciousness of the inefficiency of Protestantism, led to the formation of the Evangelical Alliance—an alliance whose results have by no means answered to the hopes of its founders and supporters. In its best forms and under the most favorable circumstances, Protestantism has failed to achieve a success commensurate with its pretensions, or with the demands of the age. In many cases, so far from success in pushing on to new conquests, there is a failure to hold what had been previously gained. The most candid and penetrating among her leaders are frank in the avowal of growing weakness and wide-spread defection. It is useless, in the light of these broad facts, to attempt to satisfy ourselves by referring to local and transient influences, such as the war, political preaching,

etc. The disease is general. The best triumphs of Protestantism, in the last fifty years, have been feeble and limited, compared with the immense forces employed; while the manifest failures, in view of such forces, are positively humiliating. Can any of the Evangelical leaders tell us when the millennium will begin,—basing their calculations on the present rate of progress of evangelical denominations?

It demands the most anxious investigation on the part of all lovers of truth—why, in this enlightened age, and in countries where Protestants have all the advantage, Roman Catholicism should vaunt her growing triumphs, and Infidelity, in its motley hues, rejoice at the wide spread of its delusions, while the statistics of the most venerable and the most popular among orthodox denominations, exhibit either a meager increase or an actual decrease in their membership?

While admitting the influence of local and temporary embarrassments, such as may for a time arrest the progress of religious interest without just occasion for serious alarm, we are disposed, in view of all the facts before us, to regard the present condition of the Protestant churches as somewhat alarming; sufficiently so to prompt an anxious inquiry into the causes of these declensions.

We presume not to enter on a complete enumeration of these causes. We simply desire to submit some reflections which may assist inquirers in reaching a satisfactory conclusion.

1. It seems to us very clear that Protestants have failed in loyalty to their own principles. While asserting the right of private judgment, and stoutly repudiating the authority of the church over the conscience, they have practically denied the right of private judgment, and have practically enforced the authority of the church over the conscience. The result of this infidelity to their cardinal principles has been a loss in two directions. Such as were disposed to rest in submission to human authority, have found a worthier resting place in the pale of the Church of Rome, where authority compels unity, than they could find in the jarring, discordant sects of Protestantism; while those who thoroughly learned the Protestant lesson of liberty of conscience—and that is by far the larger number—have been as bold to question the right of dictation when affirmed in Protestant churches, as they were taught to be in questioning the claims of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. They have learned to show as little reverence for the speculative theology of Protestant sects, which it was sought to bind on their consciences, as for the arbitrary assertions of irrational doctrine by the Mother Church. This class have drifted away into skepticism. It is a large class now. In former times, when theological controversies were rife, and there seemed to be a reason for the strife, men ranged themselves with the party that suited them, and in the

excitements of the contest, forgot their own and their party's inconsistencies. But a new generation has come up: a generation of educated, inquiring minds. They enter not into the spirit of the controversies of the past. They refuse to be bound by the standards of their fathers. They demand that which shall meet their own wants and their own times. And when they ask for bread and receive a stone; when their hungry souls crave fresh bread of life, and receive only the musty theology of a by-gone age, they in their turn protest against the arbitrariness of human authority, and wander away into the lawless freedom of Infidelity. The evangelical clergy are slow to see that the authority of creeds and parties is decaying; that the magic power of such names as Luther, Calvin, and Wesley, is lost. But they may as well open their eyes to the fact. Everywhere you will find educated, earnest minds, wandering in the mazes of skepticism—driven thither because they could not be content with the dogmatic theology of a past age; or because the endless divisions and strifes of Protestants rendered them hopless of any good results to themselves or to the world. Generally, these men are not irreligious. They do not run into infidelity to seek a shelter for their vices. They are seeking more elevated views of God and Man, than they have been accustomed to. Could they see a united church bearing the message of mercy to the sinful and outcast, and developing the attractions of brotherly love and philanthropy, according to the New Testament, they would soon be charmed into forgetfulness of their theological difficulties, and find a worthy field of exercise for hand, and head and heart, in the church of Christ. It is impossible to estimate the extent of the injury done to noble and earnest natures, by the intolerance, bigotry and strife of our party organizations. If the pulpit would serve the present age effectively, preachers must abandon their treadmills of systematic theology, cast off the tyranny of sectarian authority, and freely and manfully preach the gospel of the grace of God.

II. There has been a process of *secularizing the church*, going on for many years, which has involved an immense loss of spiritual power. The increase of wealth, in our country, has been rapid and great. This is always perilous to spiritual interests. It transfers confidence from God to gold. Human policy invades and conquers faith. The lusts of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, which are not of the Father, but of the world, assume dominion where humility and piety once reigned. Pride, formality and fashion, enter the temple, and crowd out the brotherly kindness, love, and fellowship of former years. There are increasing tokens of external prosperity—more costly edifices, a more pompous ritualism, a more fashionable auditory, and more polished sermons: but the song that once rolled

up like thunder from the crowd of earnest worshipers, has given place to the quartette; the broken in heart no longer throng the altar; the crowd of poor and needy sinners that once hasted eagerly to the sanctuary for the word of life, are abashed to enter the glittering temple of fashion; and the words of fire that once poured from the pulpit and burned in the bones, are succeded by an elegant and learned rhetoric which never wounds and never heals. "Christ crucified," as the unchanging theme of pulpit power, is exchanged for a sermon on the last railroad accident, or on Napoleon as Antichrist, or on the Glory and Shame of our country. The prayer-meeting is forsaken for the opera, the theater, or the ball-room. The multitude are "at ease in Zion." Is it any wonder that the eye of faith can trace "Ichabod" on the frescoed walls of these gaudy temples? Even the eye of sense is beginning to read it.

The itch for respectability in the eyes of the world—the anxiety to convert men of wealth and influence, while the poor and ignorant are neglected, is the bane of the churches, especially in the large cities. The Roman Catholics understand how to make their most magnificent cathedrals a common home for all classes of worshipers; but Protestants have not learned the lesson. Catholics never forget to reach out a hand of encouragement to *the people;* Protestants are satisfied with a select company of the educated and wealthy. Protestants close their churches for months, to give their dyspeptic minister a chance for recreation; Catholics open the doors of their churches every day, and their priests wait, from early dawn, at the altar, to minister to the children of toil who anticipate their working hours to pay their devotions. Christians are no longer "a peculiar people." The world has been somewhat Christianized, and the church has been largely secularized: *the aggressive spirit of the early church is lost.*

We have more to say in another number. I. E.

ENDOWMENT OF BETHANY COLLEGE.

Dear Bro. Pendleton:—It must be gratifying to every lover of education, and especially of *religious* education, to learn any encouraging facts connected with its progress. Independent of those with whom I have been in direct communication, but few, probably, of the readers of the Harbinger are aware of the fact that any effort looking to the *general* Endowment of Bethany College has been made. For the gratification, therefore, of all interested, and as far as possible, through such examples of liberality, to stimulate in others a like generous sentiment, I send for publication the following names of Donors and their several contributions to this object. The list is *incomplete*,

in view of the wish of some contributors, who prefer from personal considerations that their gifts, though generous, should not appear at present. Besides these, it is also proper to note, that I have withheld till another occasion, the publication of all donations made for completing the Alumni Hall and other parts of the College Building, and also those made by churches for the special endowment of the Biblical Department.

FOR ENDOWMENT OF BETHANY COLLEGE.

OHIO.	
WOOSTER.	
Elder Benj. Franklin	$ 100
Constant Lake	300
N. A. Walker	50
NASHVILLE.	
George B. Orner	25
Daniel Knox	25
John Darnall	50
SHREVE.	
H. M. Priee	50
America Funk	50
E. Aylesworth	5
A. J. Everley	3
Silas Funk	10
Martha Bird	10
DELAWARE.	
C. D. Hurlbutt	100
CINCINNATI.	
W. Dickinson	500
Jos. F Mills	1000
R. M. Bishop & Co.	2000
E. Williams, M. D.	500
B. W. Wasson	100
MILLERSBURG.	
Jacob Cherryholmes	50
Lewis Mayer	25
ALLIANCE	
A. B. Way	25
HOLMESVILLE.	
Jas. Foster	5
Thos. Terry	10
Robt. Dunbar	10
Samuel Boner	5
R. J. Cameron	50
AKRON.	
M. Jewett	10
SPARTA.	
Dr. D. T. Gans	500

PENNSYLVANIA.	
BRADDOCK'S,	
Isaac Mills	500
J. N. Shellenberger	200
LAURELVILLE.	
Jacob Lobengier	500
NEWCASTLE,	
T. W , C. M. & J. T. Phillips	50,000
NEW HAVEN.	
George Nickel	300
Cyrus W. Robinson	100
BROAD FORD.	
H. S. Darsie	25
J. Newcomer	50
David Galley	50
Wm. Washington	100
J. T. Strickler	10
MT. PLEASANT.	
J. T. Cunningham	25
Doctor Loar	10
JOHNSTOWN.	
R. T. Davis	2
V. Luther	2
UNIONTOWN.	
Wm. Gans	100

KENTUCKY.	
COVINGTON.	
W. B. Mooklar	1000

TO LIBRARY FUND.	
R. M. Bishop, Cin , Ohio	5,000
Total	63,442

I cannot consent to this formal registry of names and amounts without acknowledging my full appreciation of that very respectful and deliberate hearing, which on all occasions was accorded me

while presenting the considerations on which our appeal was based. Nor can I bear too strong testimony to that Christian spirit which prompted so generous a response as is evidenced by the above statement. Did not delicacy forbid, it would give me unfeigned pleasure, in this connection, to relate a few incidents calculated to awaken the liveliest sense and conception of the noble impulses and resolutions which regulate the conduct and life of the *true steward* of Christ. I may be pardoned, however, in saying, that wherever obligation appeared, it was cheerfully recognized; wherever duty existed, it was acknowledged and discharged; and whatever of good was to be accomplished, through the instrumentality of their Master's "pound," to this it was heartily committed.

Not one dollar of all this amount, so far as known to me, was obtained through pressure of any external, worldly influence or circumstance. For in no case was any passion or local prejudice appealed to. Our motives were drawn from the Bible, and the gift was in each instance a tribute from hearts touched by the example of Christ and guided by his teachings. Otherwise than this, we should have felt dishonored ourself, and dishonoring others; while if successful, this aggregate corruption would furnish no proper occasion or warrant of thanksgiving to God therefor. It is only the donations extorted by appeals to the lower prejudices of man, that are followed by dissatisfaction, regrets and maledictions. If we would have the continued good will of the giver, let only such considerations be presented to influence him, as will, in the eye of his own enlightened reason and conscience, under all circumstances and at all times, justify the act. This is the only way in which lasting favor can be secured to any benevolent scheme, and by which the consciousness of having *done right* so remains with the giver, as to become at all times no inconsiderable source of pleasure and blessing.*

Permit me further to remark, that while this highly cherished Institution of learning will derive from these contributions new powers for good, they are not without a value in another respect. They furnish strong assurance of a resolute and determined purpose upon the part of the Disciples of Christ to commit themselves and all they have to the interest of their Master's cause. If the labor of the last four months has impressed us with any lesson, it is, that we may look *most hopefully* to the future of the church as it relates to the accomplishment of whatever depends upon the devotion and fidelity of human agencies and ability to the consummation of its glorious destiny. We hail

* For if an American Statesman could say, "I had rather be right than to be President," a Christian Philanthropist may feel that he had rather be right than to be rich.

with gladness this encouraging indication, and would urge others, who can and should, to confirm by their act this most pleasurable anticipation. Are there not many yet whose accumulated and accumulating wealth is blessing neither themselves nor others, and between whom and it the partition of death will soon intervene, who will emulate the example of these noble brethren, in making proper use of that which the Lord has entrusted to their management? Are there not some, also, who from their moderate fortune, will illustrate their veneration for the sacred teachings, by giving "as the Lord has prospered *them*"? And are there not still others, who, though it be an *act of self-denial*, will cheerfully give, that *they* may exhibit to the world that they "have the mind of Christ"? "It is more blessed to *give* than to receive," and he who said it, has declared that "if any man *will do his will*, he shall KNOW of the doctrine whether it be of *God* or whether I speak of myself."

ALBERT ALLEN, Chn. Endowment Com.

CHRONICLES.

DR. ARMITAGE.

I like Bro. Armitage, President of the Bible Union. He is a good Baptist, and a better disciple. The name could be changed without altering the thing—or rather the man. In this, however, I may err.—For names do have a potent influence over men. Call one a bad name, and it is ten to one, but that in process of time he will justly deserve it. The evil passions awakened and cherished in the mind of him who wears and of those who gave it, will transform the character, and make the ugly application "a father to the thought." My old Pastor, Dr. Fishback, used to say, "that God by the gospel made men Christians, but men put their own ear-marks upon them and claimed them ever afterwards as their own." Up to the time when the private mark was put upon them, they served as brethren, but so soon as they received it, they served the party or the sect to which they were transferred. It will take an age to clean out the foul breath of partyism, even after the "one immersion" shall be restored. We doubt not but the *lustration* will go farther to clean the vessel than any other process, but after this process, a systematic fumigation will be needed and the fragrant odor of divine love diffused throughout it, before the villainous smell of partyism shall be removed.

The Doctor had an unpleasant task to perform in pleading for "Christian union" in the "Reformed Dutch Church," Fifth Avenue, New York, in the presence of Dr. Smith, of the Episcopal Church;

Dr. Rice, of the Presbyterian, and Dr. Vermilye, Reformed Dutch. He deserves our thanks for the manner in which he discharged the duty. He knew the dangerous passage he was doomed to make, in that turbulent and rapid sea, between Scylla and Charybdis, but he made it, and came out without loss. It required a good pilot and a steady helm and a strong ship. It is not every one whom Providence places in such an emergency; or being placed in it, will do as bravely.

It is certainly true, that not the Supper, but the Immersion, is the cause of all this clamor about strict communion. Open communion was the order of the day in apostolic times—*open* to all who were in Christ. And open communion is the same now as it was then. The principle is as good to-day as it was in the year of our Lord 50. All outside, neither sought for nor expected it. The case is a simple one, and of easy disposition. Let all parties and people, on the profession of their faith, be baptized, i. e, immersed, and there would be *open* communion, *strictly* confined to the body. This is the sum of the whole matter, and no people understand it better than the Pedobaptists. Strict communion and open communion are not the real questions at issue. These are side issues altogether. They are designed to *asperse* the character of the Baptists by such "*aspersionists*" as Dr. Rice and others. He would rather *asperse*, as he tells us, than immerse! He believes in it in more ways than one.

In Dr. Armitage's sermon, he asks the question, "*What is Christian union?*" Let us attempt to answer it. He says, "There were no sects in the apostolic church; therefore we want no union of *sects* in the modern church, for that would be the sum total of sectarianism. *But we do want a union of Christians.* The prayer of Jesus is, that those who believe on me may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one *in us*. Not "one" as men may be in one ecclesiastical body, but "one in *us*." Jesus prays to the Father that "they may be one as *we* are one."—"Then for what does Jesus pray? That all his followers may be one, precisely as he and the Father are one—not that they form a union, but that they constitute a unity. Then his prayer contemplates that believers should attain a oneness of mind in the faith, and not merely a oneness of feeling—a oneness of heart in the obedience they offer—and a oneness of heart in the works which they do." We might add, a *manifested* oneness, seen and read of all men. To produce any effect on the world for its conversion, this is indispensable. And for this end Jesus prays for all those "who believe on him through the word of the apostles,—that the world may believe that God had sent him." The conversion of the world is suspended upon the unity of the church.

The Doctor proceeds, "And then Jesus measures this Christian unity by the standard of the divine nature. 'That they be one as we are one.' If this unity among Christians consits of mere heart-kindness, there is no visible appositeness in this momentous petition. The Father and the Son are one in *feeling*, *action*, *counsel*, *name*.—Therefore the prayer means that Christians are to be one in the same sense; that is, in *feeling*, *action*, *counsel*, *name*."

These are noble sentiments. They have the true ring, and remind us of the days of the "Christian Baptist." By the way, let the Doctor learn a lesson from the name of that time honored monthly. It still adhered to the title "Baptist," with "Christian" as an adjective attached to it. The word "Baptist" as a noun has been long since dropped, and the word "Christian"—no longer used as an adjective—has become a noun. Why should not Dr. Armitage and the church over which he presides do the same? If they are the same "in *feeling*, *action*, *counsel*," as the Father and Son would have them, why not also in *name?* Take this step in advance of your brethren, and place yourself right on the record. JAMES CHALLEN.

N. B. Send to Bro. T. Holman, New York, cor. Center and White Streets, for "Christian Union; Real and Unreal"—price 10 cents; and also for a package of his Tracts. *They are just what we want.* They should be scattered by the thousand. Send five dollars and get a parcel and use them.—J. C.

SPIRITUAL DECLENSION.—NO. II.

In a former number we noticed the painful and startling evidences of spiritual declension, and assigned some reasons for the present state of things in the churches called Evangelical. The last reason assigned—the secularizing of the church—is one which concerns us, as well as others. One of the most discouraging features of a church's history, is the decay of piety with the increase of wealth. The increase of wealth is always greatly to be desired, because of the power it gives of enlarged usefulness. But it is a power full of peril.—The Scriptures have not vainly recorded their tremendous warnings against "the deceitfulness of riches." It is difficult to preserve humility, piety and brotherly love, where wealth and its attendant temptations abound. The church should be the common home of all the children of God. No distinctions should be known among the worshipers. Pride, and extravagance of dress, and all else that tends to create *caste* among the equal members of the spiritual family, should

be sternly banished from the assemblies of the saints. While wealth is desirable for the erection of suitable houses of worship, and for the more efficient prosecution of the work of the church, let us be careful how we make gold our confidence, or allow its increase to work mischief to the poor. Houses of worship should be commodious and comfortable—but plain and unadorned. The wealthy members of a church should appear in the place of worship in simple dress. As wealth increases, solicitude for the poor and needy should increase. Whatever distinctions may prevail in social life, *let them never be known in the church of God*, where "all are one in Christ Jesus."

We do not speak thus, as indulging in a sweeping condemnation of the rich. We are happy to know many men of wealth who have not been spoiled by their riches—men and women who recognize their stewardship, and are "rich in good works." But still we insist on the truth of all we have uttered. There is peril to the church in the increased wealth of her membership—such a peril as should call us to "watch and pray." We have always been inclined to the spiritual rule of prophetical interpretation, which allows a thousand years of a spiritual reign of the saints before the personal advent of the Savior. Yet we are free to confess to a difficulty in the way, which we have never known how to surmount: that is, to preserve the integrity of the saints unbroken through a thousand years of uninterrupted prosperity. Faith and piety thrive best in adversity. Times of prosperity are times of laxity and corruption. If the result shall show a millennium of peace and prosperity unattended by defection and apostasy, it will be the most glorious miracle of grace the universe has ever beheld.—At all events, *that* millennium has not yet begun. The church is not yet beyond the corrupting influence of prosperity. We cannot doubt that the loss of power complained of, in such cities as Cincinnati, will be found to be in the ratio of the increase of wealth and pride and fashion in the worshipers. *Let him that readeth, understand.*

III. We cannot but trace much of this failure, to the *decay of faith in the Word of God.* We are painfully impressed with the evidences of a growing infidelity in the churches. Let not the reader treat this as a rash utterance. It is thoughtfully written. Infidelity is a want of faith, or a want of fidelity. Not all the infidelity is seen in the throng of avowed unbelievers. The church and the pulpit hold many who are wanting in fidelity to the teachings of the Word of God—wanting in confidence in the divine arrangements and ordinations.—The church has been somewhat startled by the avowed skepticism of Bishop Colenso, and the authors of Essays and Reviews; and still

more by the lively sympathy with them, manifested by many church dignitaries. But this is not confined to England—it grows not entirely out of the union of Church and State. It is in our own country, and in high places in the orthodox as well as in the heterodox churches.

So far as Unitarianism is concerned, it has never been remarkable for its hold upon the masses. Since the infusion of rationalism, by Theodore Parker and others, it is still less a power among the people. This they are themselves beginning to see and confess.

"A pamphlet has recently been published containing the 'Proceedings of the Western Unitarian Conference,' which body held its sittings in the city of Cincinnati, in June last. From the statements made at the Convention, we should infer that the rich soil of the West is not adapted to the growth of Unitarianism. Mr. Staples, of Milwaukie, said:

'We have lived in the West many years, and have seen no manifestations of a great want of Unitarian literature, or of educational institutions, or of churches, on any broader basis than those already existing. Many of our ministers have come to the West, expecting an enthusiastic reception, supposing that crowds would flock to hear them wherever they appeared, and they have been grievously disappointed at meeting very small congregations, and very little encouragement to preach a second time. We have tried to found a great liberal college of the highest character (Antioch), unshackled by any sectarian narrowness, yet it has awakened very little interest among the Western people.'

"Mr. Hillard, the pastor at Detroit, said:

'The congregation has averaged, on pleasant Sundays, about one hundred and eighty. Some believe everything, some believe nothing. Some believe a little, and some are trying to believe something. Taking all things into account, this society is a pleasant one, and will rank among the first connected with the Conference!'"

Now all orthodox people will trace this to their departure from the Word of God—their infidelity to Christian principles; and we join in it as a righteous judgment. Let not the orthodox blame us, then, if we bring home to their doors, the evidences of similar departure from the Word of God. Read this:

"In a speech in the Episcopal Triennial Convention, at Philadelphia, the Lord Bishop of Montreal hinted that for the instruction of the people in religious truth, he preferred the prayer book to the Bible. Bishop Talbot, of Indiana followed him, remarking, among other things, that if he was forced to choose between sending the Bible or prayer book to the ignorant and perishing, he would choose the latter."

What is this but infidelity? Is it not making void the Word of God by their traditions? Is it not "another gospel," in a sense clear

and strong with that in which Paul used the phrase in his Epistle to the Galatians? And this is the language of *Bishops* in the Protestant Episcopal Church!

And what is it but infidelity, when men plead for *parties* among Christians, and attempt to justify the existing denominations, in their sectarian peculiarities—in the face of the plainest teachings and warnings of the Holy Spirit? Did not Paul charge the Christians with *carnality*, because there were *strifes* and *divisions* among them? Did not he solemnly charge them that there should be *no* divisions among them? Did not the same apostle rank *sects* among the "works of the flesh," and declare that "they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God"? Did not the Savior himself teach that a house divided against itself cannot stand? Did he not earnestly pray that his people might be *one*, on purpose that the world might believe? Yet, in the face of these plain and emphatic declarations, men who profess to be guides to the blind, persist in declaring that many sects and parties are preferable to one church, and that the world can be more readily converted by numerous sects than by a united church! Now we care not how plausible the reasonings may be by which such a view is supported; the point we make is, that it is not only unsupported by, but contrary to, the Word of God. *Faith* will cling to the divine teaching, in the face of all seeming difficulties; it is unbelief that ignores these teachings, and seeks support in pleas of expediency. A faith so feeble as to be unable to trust the unmistakable teaching of the Scriptures touching the unity of the church, is too feeble to cope with the difficulties in the way of the church's progress. We tell the Protestant clergy, plainly and faithfully, that they can never lift Protestantism into decisive and permanent victory, until they have faith enough in God to abandon the plea for denominationalism, and religiously abandon sect and creed, for the sake of the "one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism" of the gospel.

We are pleased to see that the truth on this subject is forcing its way. Even the *New York Observer*, ever the apologist of denominationalism, and firm in the conviction that the work of God can be accomplished as well through a divided as a united church, is making rapid strides towards the advocacy of union, and conceding the evils and mischiefs of partyism. From an editorial in that paper of Nov. 30, we clip the following extract:

"We believe that there is room for important ecclesiastical consolidation in this country, and that this is an auspicious hour to consider the possibility. The restoration of the national unity, after the late terrible example of the evils of disunion, has evidently inclined the Christian mind of the nation to advanced views of church fraternization. Good men everywhere among us long for more intimate ties

of Christian fellowship, weaving closer together both Church and State. Bishop Potter's letter has not checked, but only challenged out this sentiment. A variety of Christian denominations is an accommodation of a variety of religious opinions or scruples; it is an advantage, therefore, to a certain extent, and unquestionably pacificatery in its tendency, as preventing collisions and strifes. But, if we mistake not, the Christian conscience of this country is becoming more and more convinced that we have extravagantly erred in this respect; that if we need some cardinal divisions, we need not so many subdivisions; and that perhaps the greatest sin of the American Church has been in its disregard of the unity of the faith. If we would repent of this sin, we must do works meet for repentance.—The first of such works, as we said lately, is the promotion, not so much of the consolidation of different sects, as of their fellowship in their common Head and Lord. Most of our evangelical denominations can come nearer to each other; their pastors can certainly approach one another more intimately, and if they do, their people will not only accept but rejoice in the example. The common Christian people of this country are, much more than their pastors, eager for a greater liberty of charity, a more apostolic unity of the kingdom of their common Lord. We see nothing whatever in the way of the entire body of Protestant pastors of the evangelical churches of this city instantly striking hands, and proclaiming to their people that from this year of our restored national peace and unity a new era shall open to our churches, that mutual estrangements and hostilities shall be merged in mutual charity, and practical co-operation for the salvation of this depraved metropolis. And we believe the people would shout a general apostolic amen to the declaration.

But we go farther than this. We believe that now is the auspicious time for not a little ecclesiastical union. Who doubts that there are unnecessary sects among us, and a consequent and great waste of religious energy and good feeling? We must guard sacredly our fundamental Christianity against heresy; but have we not been too eager to guard our mere incidental as well as our fundamental peculiarities, our bigotry as well as our faith? Are we not discovering that our policy of self protection needs revision: that there is a policy for the repression of heresy which only underrates it, fortifies it, and gives it greater scope of moral devastation. We may be too eager to scent out heresy; that is imitating dogs, not the saints to whom the the faith was once delivered. Error, mostly latent, that might have died in its dormancy, has often been roused into destructive activity by the importance given it through over-zealous opposition. This has been, probably, the capital sin of the modern Evangelical Church."

This is well, and shows considerable insight alike into the mischiefs and folly of these divisions, and the tendency of sectarian rigor to develop rather than to extinguish heresies. It only needs a manly application of the facts and logic of the editor to prove the folly and wickedness of *all* parties in the church, and the necessity of a union in one body, of all the followers of Christ.

But even among the earnest advocates of union, there are as yet but feeble indications of faith in God. The Christian Union Associ-

ation, recently formed, and comprising many able and earnest men, proposes to unite all who can adopt the Apostles' and the Nicene creeds. Why did they pause amid the mists of an already corrupted church? Why not ascend to the fountain head—and propose a union on a truly apostolic basis? We cannot attribute it to want of sincerity or of honesty. Their entire course forbids such an imputation. *Their faith is too feeble to trust the Church on the divine basis.* They fear that the word of God would let in heretics. They dread the failure of their plans, if they trust all "to God and the word of his grace"; although, in full view of approaching heretics and herisies Paul was content to point out this as an all-sufficient refuge for the imperiled church of God! Such a faith can never overcome the world.

Is it any wonder, then, that we hear of declensions—even in the midst of superabundant means for pushing forward the triumphs of the Gospel? that the church fails to grapple vigorously with the intelligence and conscience of the age, and guide it to Christ? Let Protestants be true to their principles—divorce the soul from all human authority; return perfectly to the word of God; present, in opposition to the negative unity of the Church of Rome, a positive living unity of faith in Christ and obedience to his laws: know only Jesus Christ and him crucified; and unite her mighty but scattered forces for the evangelization of the world; and see if heaven pour us not out such a blessing that there shall not be room enough to receive it. I. E.

SCHOOLS FOR PREACHERS.—NO. 3.

CONCLUSION.

We propose in this concluding paper to set forth what we conceive to be the proper course of instruction for the ministerial student.—We have long and well considered this matter, and believe the ground here taken is the only one in harmony with apostolical Christianity, and with the true work of the preacher of the gospel; it alone will meet the approbation and hearty support of every true Disciple of Christ. The convictions here set forth are earnest and positive, and will be the guide of all we shall do in the work of ministerial education.

1. The education in the preachers' school must be *purely* and *thoroughly* Biblical. As was stated in the beginning of these articles, the theological schools of the past and of the present are no guide for us; they cannot be. Our calling as a people is a peculiar one, and the preachers among us must have a peculiar preparation. *Sys-*

tems of Theology, the production of men, time-worn, worm-eaten, effete, and 'ready to pass away,' can have no place nor lot in our system of education. The eternal, ever living word of God alone is the true fountain of knowledge here. The others kill, this alone makes alive. The human is powerless, as it is unauthorized; the divine alone is the power of God, and imparts this power to the man of God; it alone thoroughly furnishes him to every good work in his great calling. We demand a sound and *healthy* course of Biblical education, as opposed entirely to that enervating, narrowing, enslaving system of theological training pursued in the various party schools.—This makes a slave, that a free man; that gives vigor to mind and soul, this imparts weakness. Theological training, as generally practiced,—the dragging of the mind through the charnel-houses of mouldy theology, saps the very fountains of true life and vigor, and establishes a mortal *dry rot* in the mind and in the soul. The topics, the ideas, the language and method that such an *un*-evangelical, unapostolical schooling introduces into the pulpit, are powerless to save the world, and a terrible incubus on the mission of the gospel. The great, living truths of the gospel, as they stand boldly in clear outline before us on the holy pages, grand in simplicity, grand in their soul-awakening power,—these are the lessons to which we would invite the earnest spirit preparing for the work of God. A man armed with such a preparation, has a divine reliance, a heavenly power within him; he knows whereof he affirms. His weapons are from the armory of heaven. The 'Institutes' of Prophets, Evangelists and Apostles, are what we would offer as the text book;—the New Testament as the 'Communes Loci' for the ministerial student. We would draw water ourselves, direct from the 'wells of salvation,' and not take it from the rotten casks and the decayed cisterns of time-hoary or more modern theologies. Let what may be true in the tomes of Calvin, Gill, Owen, Fuller or Dwight,—this does not for a moment concern us; we cannot accept these as text books; the Bible alone we shall accept; this alone study and teach. Every advanced step in the study of Christianity; every maturer reflection; every day's additional experience, strengthens our conviction in the correctness of the great cardinal principle of our plea for Primitive Christianity,—the Bible *alone* as a rule of faith and practice; a full, positive return to the apostolical order of things, as the only legitimate course to please God and to save the world. We would insist on realizing, in the fullest and most practical way, this great principle in a course of education for the ministry.

This Scriptural instruction must be the *primary* matter, all else subsidiary to it. The mind and heart of the preacher should be

filled with the Word of God. If other things are allowed to have the precedence, the chief places in study, they will fill the preacher's head, and will be on his tongue, to the perversion, emasculation, and destruction of his ministry. This is lamentably true of so large a portion of the *theologically* educated men. Their theological *lore* has 'choked the word.' *We* want no such preachers!

This education in the doctrine of the Bible must be *thorough*. The great topics of the gospel must be carried through the whole course of the Divine Word. The cardinal proofs and foundations must be brought forth and impressed on the mind. This will require labor,—but an education without such labor is but an idle cheat. It must likewise be *positive*. Positive truth, well-grounded, decided, *positive* convictions, alone are the true basis of a manly life, of a true faith, and of a real power. This is what made the apostolic preachers so strong, this is what gave the early preachers in this plea for primitive Christianity such power, and so triumphantly leads to success. We want men that are well and thoroughly grounded in their convictions, that believe what they say, and therefore will speak with confidence, and will not be forever swaying from side to side, double-minded,—not sure whether what they preach is true or not. A miserable and most unreliable thing, is such a man's life. The preachers of this reformation must be men that can be relied on, whose full convictions we know, can approve and sustain. Let us have no fellowship with, and give no encouragement to, men in the ministry of cloudy, vacillating, uncertain views on the great questions of the gospel; on the divinity of Christ, the inspiration of the Bible, faith, baptism, the final judgment of God on the wicked, &c.;—it is most fatal to the cause of the gospel to have such men in the ministry. In a school for preachers, therefore, we insist that the great truths of the Bible shall be taught, in form and spirit, *positive*.

2. What is to be the practical carrying out of the course of *Biblical* instruction here indicated? First, the *introduction*, properly so called, to the study of the Holy Scriptures. This will be a critical examination, in a course of well-prepared lectures, as brief as possible, of the history of the books that constitute the Bible;—embracing their origin and authority, genuineness and authenticity, claims to inspiration, literary character, and the peculiarities of the writers.—Secondly, the study of the Hebrew language, and lessons in the Hebrew Scriptures—the classics of that language. In these lessons the text is not only to be translated and studied grammatically, but exegetically likewise. To this will also be added the study of the Greek Scriptures—Septuagint and New Testament, especially the latter, in the same way, embracing also the history and peculiarities of the

New Testament Greek, literary peculiarities of authors, &c. For example, the Gospel of John, in selections, will be read, critically examined in its words and passages, always with reference to the meaning and teaching of the text; so also the Epistle to the Romans, and other selections from the apostolic writings, seeking always from the original fountain to learn the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Thirdly, an examination and setting forth of the cardinal elements of the doctrine of Christ. For example: The character of the Lord Jesus, as set forth in the New Testament; the doctrine of the atonement; the great facts of the gospel; the commands of the gospel; the church and its ordinances, &c., &c. Each one of these topics will be treated of singly and fully, and traced through the Scriptures, deducing them from the Scriptures and looking to them alone for proofs. This we regard as a most valuable and an indispensable part of the preacher's education, demanding very especial attention. To this will be added, as far as time allows, a general course of lectures on other leading topics of the Bible, such as the Fall, the Deluge, the Patriarchal Covenants, the Jewish Institution, the types and the prophetic element of the Old Testament, and the prophetic element of the New, as the Apocalypse. What has been embraced in this section, will be treated of in lectures, that must be well prepared, so as to present the subject fully, briefly, and forcibly. In this way much can be done in a short time; it is the *multum in parvo* method. A mere desultory, illy-prepared, extempore course of lectures, will not answer the purpose; it is the idle *parvum in multo* method. There are are also other special subjects in the Bible, not here enumerated, that may be made, as deemed necessary, the topics of occasional special lectures. The course of the *direct* study of the Bible we have thus indicated, is to be followed in the school for preachers at Bethany College.—The collateral studies, as indicated in the College catalogue, will be made to harmonize with this course, and will not be allowed to encroach upon the time and attention due to it. We shall earnestly strive to subject these subsidiary and preparatory studies fully to the spirit of the Word of God, making it in spirit and form the supreme law of the whole system of ministerial education.

3. An object of the course here proposed, and that we shall seek practically to carry out, will be, first, to fortify the rising ministry against every form of *unscriptural innovation*. There is all over our Christian land a general tendency to yield to the loose, licentiously latitudinarian spirit of accommodation to the worldly, carnal demands of our age,—a spirit manifesting itself even in the heretofore most orthodox and staid denominations. This tendency, that in its workings will kill the spiritual life and power in the church of God, must

not be allowed to enter among us and triumph over us. Secondly,—the ministry must be fortified against any inducements to compromise the truth of God with sectarianism, for respectability's sake, or for charity's sake. These men must be so well grounded in their convictions and devotions, and so well guarded, as to be firm and faithful in the great trust committed to them. Lastly,—they must be well fortified against the awful tide of skepticism sweeping over the religious world, and now coming near to every church and to every man's door. We want men that are not to be led away by every wind of doctrine, by every new apparition; that are not to be charmed by every blazing meteor of so-called pulpit popularity, and in silly apings of these 'wandering stars,' learn to think and speak lightly of the great ancient faith of God's true people, and, abandoning the eternal, positive truths of the gospel, that are unpalatable to the carnal heart, seek to preach a gospel without offense, by catering to the sinful spirt of the world, in preaching on themes and in a manner unknown to the gospel and the primitive preachers of the Cross. These are the men that claim to be par excellence *progressive* men; that is to say, progressing downward; making day by day less of all positive religion, of all positive faith and all positive commandments. This fearful tendency to abandon all the ancient, positive, distinguishing truths and institutions of the religion of Christ, and accepting instead those of the so called progressive, light-shod, complacent, rationalistic neologies of our day, is making awful havoc in the religious sentiment and life of our nation, as it has done and is doing elsewhere. We want it to be a special task of any educational work for the ministry, to fit men to stem this tide of evil,—to save themselves and others from it.

4. Finally,—and we would put great stress on this,—a school for preachers should, throughout its entire course of instruction and training, seek especially and constantly to awake in the *hearts* of the men that are to be preachers, a true, self-sacrificing evangelical spirit of devotion to the work of the gospel. It should seek to make not mere professional men, looking out for a life of ease and ambition; but men yearning, at any cost and any sacrifice, to save souls;—men ready to say, 'Here am I, send me'! To this end we want and must have a really *evangelical* school, that in its teachers, in its instructions, in all its life, is filled with the great spirit of the gospel; so that the men that shall come forth from it, shall be, not the dead and dying forms, fed on the husks and choked with the mouldering dust and ashes of sect-theology,—but *living* men, full of a glorious evangelical life, ready and fit to preach to man the living gospel of the Living God!

C. L. L.

LETTER FROM AUSTRALIA.

MELBOURNE, VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA, 25 Aug. 1865.

DEAR BROTHER PENDLETON:—A year—ending last month—has rolled swiftly by since our beloved and highly esteemed Bro. Henry S. Earl, a regular graduate of Bethany College, arrived in this city—the Metropolis of the Southern Continent—to labor as an Evangelist. I therefore do myself the pleasure of forwarding a summary of his labors during that period. From the gladdening reports that from time to time reached us of what he had been the means of doing in Britain, we were led to expect great blessings. Nor have we been disappointed. Each Lord's day hundreds assemble in our largest public building that is available, to hear the way of life made known, as given by the inspired Heralds of the Savior eighteen centuries ago. The average attendance must be about 1500 and the interest increases rather than otherwise. These large audiences are composed of all classes, high and low, members of all denominations and numbers who never habitually attended the preaching of the Word. Nor are they "hearers" of the Word only. Weekly our hearts are rejoiced by the addition of some who make the Good Confession before many witnesses.

Young and old of both sexes nobly come forward and take their stand on the Lord's side. Of the different popular denominations we have received a goodly number of members, many having seen it to be their duty to ask for the good old paths and to walk therein. Several occasional preachers and speakers, as well as Sunday School teachers, Tract distributors, warm-hearted, godly persons, are amongst them.—Some have already become fellow-helpers in public and many others are training for future usefulness. To this end Bro. Earl commenced an Adelphian class. Last week was the second public meeting at which several members read selections of scripture, others recited portions of God's Word, and some read Essays on moral and religious subjects. Two interesting discourses were also delivered. Very pleasing improvement was observable, and no doubt the class if persevered with will be the means of leading out several brethren into spheres of public usefulness.

The Brethren in all the churches too have been excited to greater interest, effort and liberality by witnessing the thorough heartiness with which Bro. Earl labors in the glorious Cause and the success attending his labors. We have, therefore, every reason to thank our Heavenly Father with deepest gratitude for opening up our Brother's way into our midst. The number, too, who have been won from the "world" to serve the Savior is cause for abounding thanksgiving.

The Sunday School, Bible class and Prayer Meetings have much improved both in attendance and interest. Our neat and substantial

chapel will shortly be ready for occupation, and we shall then have advantages which we now lack in a rented room. We look forward therefore to still greater success.

We have room in this colony alone for many Evangelists, and neither New South Wales, South Australia nor New Zealand have brethren wholly devoted to the work, though there are churches in each Colony, and all are anxious to spread the Truth. Bro. Earl has done what he could in visiting about the suburbs and country places adjacent to Melbourne. He has preached with gladdening results at Prahrau, Brighton, Cheltenham, Beaumaris and Bulleen. Also in the large goldmining places known as Ballaraat and Maryborough. But one man is not equal to the task of occupying the places now open—and many more could be easily made available, and rich harvests of souls be gathered. Brother Earl intends shortly—after a visit to some of the sister Colonies—to return to America, most likely by the Panama Line of Steamers, and so go by way of California. We are hoping soon to hear of an efficient Evangelist being on his way from America here. We have written with that view to Brethren Franklin, Lard, McGarvey and A. Campbell. The brethren in South Australia too are looking in the same direction with a similar object.

The total number of additions to the churches since Bro. Earl's arrival is 306, and the number influenced for good is known only to God.—May the Lord continue to bless his efforts to the ingathering of souls and the upbuilding of His people. And the same would we pray may be the happy lot of his successor here. JAMES W. WEBB.

PROSPECTUS OF VOLUME VIII. OF THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

The undersigned propose resuming the publication of "The Gospel Advocate," as a Weekly Journal, January 1st, 1866.

Our purpose is to maintain the right of Jesus Christ to rule the world, the supremacy of the Sacred Scriptures in all matters spiritual, and to encourage an investigation of every subject connected with the Church of Christ, which we may consider of practical interest. The Kingdom of God as a real, permanent institution, "The pillar and support of the Truth," upon a proper appreciation of which, the welfare of the world and the happiness of men depend; her origin, organization, history, labor and mission; her relation to worldly powers, civil, military and religious, and her final triumph, will occupy much of our attention.—The education of the world for Christianity, and the training of Christians for immortality, will constitute an important part of our labor.

The work will be published at Franklin College, Tennessee, in weekly Numbers of sixteen pages, the size of the former Gospel Advocate,

neatly folded and stitched, at $2 50 for Single Subscriber; $11 25 for Five Subscribers; $20 00 for Ten Subscribers.

We would be pleased to have the co-operation of the Brethren generally, and the Preachers of the Word especially, in circulating the paper.

T. FANNING, D. LIPSCOMB,
EDITORS & PUBLISHERS.

GOOD WORDS FROM OUR CORRESPONDENTS.

SALADO, BELL CO., TEXAS, Oct. 14th, 1865.

BRO. PENDLETON:—Though it has been long since I saw a Harbinger, its memory is sweet, and I hasten to improve the first opportunity to "stir up your pure mind" concerning this distant land.

Six or seven years ago we procured a large tent, which has been hauled from place to place, spread, and surrounded by small ones for the accommodation of the ladies, each summer and fall since. One large "common" table has answered for all: the men sleep under the large tent. The additions under this tent and at other annual meetings where I have labored, have been some two hundred per year, I think. I enclose you the minutes of two annual missionary meetings. And we sincerely desire the friends of Jesus to understand that we are still steering for the heavenly port, with all earnestness and confidence. This I say for many kindred spirits. For myself, I never labored harder, or more constantly—and never more successfully, considering the population.—The churches are generally in tolerable condition, only needing more zeal and devotion, if my understanding of the true standard is correct.

Affectionately, C. KENDRICK.

BARNESVILLE, OHIO, Nov. 26, 1865.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—We have enjoyed a very pleasant meeting here for a number of days in succession. I think I never witnessed at this place such marked attention and interest, and such good order as has generally prevailed.

The audiences were constantly large; and seventeen persons took their stand on the Rock of Ages, more than half of whom were males, and the most of them between the ages of 18 and 30. We enjoyed during a part of the meeting the assistance and hearty co-operation of our esteemed Bro. Glasier, of Bellair. The brethren are much refreshed, and truth is onward. Amen!

Your brother, &c., A. E. MYERRS.

PINE FLATS, Nov. 13th., 1865.

BROTHER LOOS:—Permit me through the Harbinger to report the result of my labor for the Pennsylvania Missionary Society in the Month of October last.

Held two meetings during the month, in West Va.; one at Beeler's Station, where we had 18 additions; the other at the church meeting near Glen Easton (Bowman's), where there were 26 added to the army of the faithful. Brother Hillock was with me at Beeler's.

Yours in hope, L. SOUTHMAYD.

OBITUARIES.

Dear Bro. Pendleton:—The cruel hand of war, which for a few years past has laid waste in our country so many homes, separated friends, and hastened into eternity so many unprepared, has been raised; and peace again—thanks to God—is spreading itself over our land. But with it and the opening up of communication with friends in different sections of the country, we often receive sad intelligence. One after another has passed over the Jordan, some prepared and others unprepared. Since the opening of the mails through that part of Tennesse in which my father resides, I have received a letter from him announcing the death of my venerable mother, Mary Myers, on the 8th of Nov., 1861, in the seventy-second year of her age. She was born in Jefferson co., East Tenn., and was descended from the Davis and Snoddy families of Va. She was for near forty years a member of the Presbyterian church, but after the great discussion between our venerable brother A. Campbell and N. L. Rice, she re-examined the subjects there disscussed, and nobly resolved to be immersed on a profession of her own faith, and take a Bible stand. This she did, and continued to rejoice in Christ her Savior to the end of her mortal life. She was a sheaf fully ripe to the harvest. Her patience, long-suffering and gentleness were seldom equaled. She was a strong-minded, noble-hearted woman, and almost all that knew her loved and respected her. Her pious and godly example before her children has left its impress upon their hearts, and they can fully say, "Blessed are the dead, who die in the Lord." Amen and Amen! She left my venerable father, John Myers, now I believe in his seventy-fourth year, eight living children, with many friends and brethren to mourn her loss.

Your brother in Christ,

Dec. 18, 1865. A. E. Myers.

NEW PLACE OF MEETING OF THE CHURCH IN NEW YORK CITY.

New York, October 10th, 1865.

Bro. Pendleton:—By a recent exchange of church properties, our congregation in this city is now located in 28th street, near Broadway.

We are now in possession of a very neat and commodious church edifice, in one of the most pleasant localities in the city, and one that is very accessible to all the principal hotels. This card is to give notice of the recent change and to cordially invite all of our brethren, from every part of the country, who may visit New York, to come and worship with us. We are now engaged in some additional improvements upon the main building, which we expect to have ready for permanent occupation by the 1st of November. In the mean time we are meeting in the lecture room.

By the blessing of our Heavenly Father, we are prospering finely, and are looking forward to larger usefulness in the kingdom of our Lord.

Fraternally yours, Urban C. Brewer.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXVI.

Address 289
Additional Testimonies for Immersion 481, 529
A. C. M. Society 503
" " Cor. Sec. of 233, 502
" " Meeting of 526
A Fantasy 189
American Colleges, Donations to 43
" Bible Union 234
An Infidel Objection annihilated 106
Anderson's Translation of the N. T. 58
An "Unsound Argument" tested 438
Apologetic 526
A Question 430
Art thou a Christian? 43
A Short Sermon for the Times 23
Australia, or the Far South 216
" Letter from 424, 571

B

Baptism of John 122
Bethany College 379, 429
" " New Trustees of 381
" " Endowment of 556
" " Meet'g of Trust. of 288
" " Course of Biblical Instruction in 421
Bible Union 234
" " Anniversary of 507, 518
" " Meeting of 236
Buckle on the Civiliza'n of Engl'd 459

C

Christ Divine 372
Christ—His two-fold Nature 130
" made a Curse 111
Christian Hymn Book, New Edit'n 432
" Faith, Nature of 277
" Worship 490
Chronicles 109, 244, 306, 330, 350, 413, 446, 559
Church Organization 256, 337
" News 527
" in New York 528, 574
Church in Detroit, Resolutions of 141
Churches, Music in 38, 88, 92, 115, 182
Cleveland Convention 499
Conversion of Paul 145
Correspondence 44, 95, 143, 189, 236, 286, 334, 384, 431, 477, 573
Critical Notes on H. T. Anderson's Translation 58, 221, 270
Cyprus, Traditions of 318

D

David, Last Words of 510
"Denominational Aspects" 19
Demonology, Modern 352, 385
Death of the President 230
Detroit, Resolutions of Church in 141
Difficulties, Skeptical 69, 137, 227
Discussion on Universalism 422
Discourse by R. Richardson 97
Domestic Religious News 141
Donations to American Colleges 43
Do we need a Theological School? 364

E

Education 209
Elders and Deacons, Ordination of 423
Endowment of Bethany College 556
Evangelist—New Series 525
Extraordinary Munificence 282
Extremes 433

F

Fear not 525
Foreknowledge and Free Will 373
Foreign Religious News 92, 231
Fragmentary Prayer 442
Fraternal Letter 26

G

Gospel Advocate, Prospectus of 572
Great Mistakes 328
Greek Synonyms of N. T. 407, 485

H

Hymnology, Protestant 396
Harbinger for 1866, 477

I

Immersion, Additional Testimonies for 481, 529
Indiana State Missionary Society 382
Individual Responsibility 157
Infidelity in London 264
Instruction for Ministers 476
Instrumental Music in Churches 38, 88, 92, 115, 182
Introduction 3
Is God the Author of Imperfection? 128

J

Jamaica Mission 501
Jerusalem Mission 333
" Letter from 125
John, Baptism of 122
Judson and the Revisers 232

K

Kentucky, Miss'ary operations in 285

L
Last Words of David 510
Letters to Little Ones 424
Letter from Jerusalem 125
" " H. T. Anderson 316
" " Australia 424, 571
Linsey-Woolsey 49
London, Popular Infidelity in 264
Luther's Translation, Revision of 91
M
Message of Good-Will 189
Metanoeoo, Metamelomai 485
Ministers, Instruction for 476
Missouri Loyalty Oath 465, 537
Missionary Work 418
Missionary Operations in Ky. 285
Modern Demonology 352, 385
Mullins Geo. G., Tribute to 285
Music in Churches 38, 88, 92, 115, 182
N
Nature of Christian Faith 277
New Translations of the Holy Scriptures 8, 221, 270
New Testament Revised 94
New York, Church in 528, 574
O
Obituaries 48, 96, 191, 239, 286, 335, 384, 431, 527, 574
Ohio Missionary Society 235
" " Meeting 278
Ordination of Elders and Deacons 423
Our Country, Romish developm'ts in 61
P
Pastor's Port-folio, Sketches from 12, 76
Pastors and Teachers 85
Paul, Conversion of 145
Pleasant Hill Female Seminary 381
Preachers, Schools for—No. 1 449
No. II 493
No. III 566
Preachers, the want of 33
Preachers' Association of West. Pa. 284
Preachers, Schools for 523
Prayer, Will God answer? 161
Prayer, Fragmentary 442
President, Death of 230
Preservation of the Scriptures 200
Protestant Hymnology 396
Progress of Roman Catholicism 455
Q
Queries 384, 427
R
Rationalistic Separatism 165
Responsibility, Individual 157
Religious News, Foreign 92, 231,
" " Domestic 141
Revision of Luther's Translation 91
Romish developm'ts in our country 61
Romanism & Religious Toleration 308
Roman Catholicism, Progress of 455
Romish Church in England, Rapid Increase of 474
R. Richardson, Discourse by 97
S
"Schools for Preachers" 523
Scylla and Charybdis 193
Scriptures, New Translations of the 8, 221, 270
Scripture Questions and Answers 324
Scriptures, Preservation of 200
Schools & Colleges for Preachers 449
" " " " No. 2, 493
" " " " No. 3, 566
Showing him a Miracle 497
Short Papers—No. 1, 118
Short Sermon for the Times 23
Sketches from a pastor's port-folio 12, 76
Skeptical Difficulties 69, 137, 227
Song of Light 426
Spiritual Declension 552, 561
Sticking for Trifles 378
T
Teachers and Pastors 85
The Walter Scott Monument 41, 173
The Want of Preachers 33
The Term "Confession" 241
The Creed Question 248
The Gospel 516
The Evangelist.—New Series 525
Theological School 364, 416
The Times, Short Sermon for 23
Translation, H. T. Anderson's 58
" Revision of Luther's 91
Traditions of Cyprus 318
Trench's Greek Synonyms of the New Testament 407, 485
Tribute to Geo. G. Mullins 285
Truth, Unsound Arguments in Support of 134, 179
U
Unitarian Convention 343
Universalism, Discussion on 422
Unsound Arguments in Support of Truth 134, 179
W
Walter Scott Monument, The 41, 173
Water or no water; Wine or no wine 80
What is the Promise—Gal. iii. 29? 124
Who and what is an Evangelist? 514
Will God answer Prayer? 161
Y
Yearly Meetings in Ohio for 1865 285